Reflections on Legal Proceedings and Related Matters:

Police Misconduct, Ineffective Legal Counsel, Corruption, and Human Rights Violations

ABSTRACT:

This document provides a comprehensive overview of events that transpired from March 2024 to present day, detailing key timelines, interactions with law enforcement, and discussing legal proceedings. The document discusses and critiques concerns regarding the conduct of police, defense counsel, and potential rights violations under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and provincial Human Rights legislation. The document includes inquiries submitted to the Ontario Human Rights Commission, and the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission. It concludes with key takeaways, lessons learned, and correspondence with various institutions including the Law Society of Ontario and my employer. The events documented herein reflect my own personal experiences from March 2024 onwards and includes communications with Crown counsel defense counsel, witnesses, and other legal and human rights bodies. The insights within are intended to demonstrate the complexities of navigating legal challenges while advocating for one's rights and maintaining adherence to legal and ethical standards.

DISCLAIMER:

All events, interactions, and facts documented herein are truthful to the best of my knowledge and recollection. Any interpretations, inferences, or conclusions drawn, are based on my personal understanding of the events as they transpired. This document is not intended to mislead or misrepresent any party or individual, but to provide a factual account of my experiences. All information has been compiled in good faith, and any inaccuracies or omissions are unintentional.

George Clements

CONFIDENTIAL

Table of Contents

CRIMINAL CHARGE *3*

BACKGROUND & TIMELINE: 3

POLICE COMPLAINTS 5

DEFENCE COUNSEL 5

CONFIDENTIALITY & DOCUMENT SUBMISSION 6

KEY TAKEAWAYS/LESSONS LEARNED 6

GENERAL INFORMATION AND BACKGROUND 8

VICTIM (ASHLEY) 9

POLICE CONDUCT 14

DEFENCE COUNSEL 17

WITNESS STATEMENTS 17

CROWN & CHARTER CONSIDERATIONS 19

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE 26

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO 31

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION 32

CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT *33*

MARCH 08, 2024: 33

MARCH 11, 2024: 34

MARCH 13, 2024: 34

MARCH 14, 2024: 36

MARCH 17, 2024: 36

MARCH 18, 2024: 37

MARCH 19, 2024: 37

MARCH 20, 2024: 37

MARCH 30, 2024: 37

FOLLOWING EVENTS: 38

DALHOUSIE CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT 40

RESIGNATION 48

DBLSA INTERNAL CULTURE 50

NOVA SCOTIA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION 52

CORRESPONDENCE WITH EMPLOYER *54*

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE LAW SOCIETY OF ONTARIO *66*

CORRESPONDENCE WITH DALHOUSIE HEALTH & WELLNESS *68*

CONFIDENTIAL

CORRESPONDENCE WITH CAPREIT ***69***
CORRESPONDENCE WITH CAR SHOPS ***70***
YOUTUBE VIDEOS ***73***
[This Page is Intentionally Left Blank] 76

CONFIDENTIAL

CRIMINAL CHARGE

To Whom It May Concern:

BACKGROUND & TIMELINE:

Considering the recent conclusion of this matter, I think it is important to clarify a few things, starting with the timeline of events. In February 2024, I made the difficult decision to end my relationship with Ashley.[1] This was not a decision I made lightly, but felt was necessary.[2] Without getting into unnecessary detail, I felt I was being subjected to environments and interactions that were emotionally distressing and disrespectful. I intended to end the relationship amicably and privately, believing relationship issues are nobody's business except for the parties in the relationship. However, Ashley was very angry with me for ending the relationship and began telling others that the reason for our breakup was the result of infidelity on my part (which is not true).[3] To support her claims, she used old photos from conversations on my phone (which predated our relationship), presenting them as current.[4] This had a very negative impact on my mental health during my last semester of law school.

In Halifax, I began to feel socially isolated due to how Ashley was portraying me to others. Consequently, I attempted to reconcile with her to restore peace in my life. On top of this, I was finding it exceedingly difficult to move on from this relationship. While I certainly was not a perfect boyfriend to Ashley, I always remained civil and respectful in my interactions with her and never even raised my voice. At the end of March 2024, I moved to Toronto prematurely (with only final papers remaining) to distance myself from Ashley and seek support from my larger social network in Toronto. However, at the end of April, I returned to Halifax to collect some of my belongings and submit my final papers. During this visit, Ashley dropped off the law school textbooks she had borrowed from me, which led us to commence talking again.

CONFIDENTIAL

In **May 2024**, Ashley also moved to Toronto, and we had mutually agreed to attempt to reconcile our relationship. However, the same issues began to resurface. Our relationship dynamics took a particular turn for the worse when Ashley began contacting my friend Elaina. She requested that I provide her with Elaina's contact information and began texting her. I did not understand why Ashley would want to do this, and it was particularly distressing for me. Despite my requests for her to stop, she continued. After about a week of continued disputes, I attempted to end my relationship with Ashley once again and told her I no longer wished to be exclusive with her but suggested remaining

---

[1] George Clements, "***Re:***" (20 February 2024) via e-mail **[communicated to Ashley Thornton]**.
[2] George Clements, "***Declined: Brunch***; ***Declined: Anniversary Date!***; ***Declined: We Need to Talk***; ***Declined: Sleepover please??***" (16–19 February 2024) via e-mail **[communicated to Ashley Thornton]**.
[3] George Clements, "***Can you admit it; Stop; Why can't you admit that?***" (25 February 2024) via text message **[communicated to Ashley Thornton]**.
[4] George Clements, "***You committed a crime; Real ethical ash***" (25 February 2024) via text message **[communicated to Ashley Thornton]**.

friends.[5] The following evening, Ashley began arguing with me via text accusing me of disloyalty (even though I had expressed my desire to end my relationship with her). This argument occurred at **2:00 AM** while she was returning home from the bar; I was up studying for the Bar exam. I asked Ashley if I could come over so we could talk about this in person as I could not handle the back-and-forth via text (a method we had previously found effective in conflict resolution). Ashley later claimed that she told me she did not want to see me, which is not the truth.

Upon arriving at Ashley's apartment, she demanded access to my mobile device. She pushed me, threw my phone, and then threatened to call the police. I was emotionally overwhelmed from dealing with this for the past three months and began to break down and cry. When the police arrived, I explained my side of the story, but it was not believed. I was then cited for criminal harassment. This terrified me, as my actions were not criminal, and Ashley had inaccurately portrayed me to the police. As a recent law school graduate studying for the bar exam, I was concerned about the professional implications of being cited by the police. As such, I wanted to clear my name. I gathered evidence, including text messages and witness statements from people familiar with the situation and those who had interacted with Ashley directly.[6] I first attempted to visit the police station and was told they could not help me but was given the emails of the responding officers. I subsequently emailed them, providing evidence to contradict how she had portrayed me. I provided the police with background information that contradicted her claims and portrayal of me. The information I provided demonstrated that she had told me to come to her apartment and that she had assaulted me and thrown my phone. I did not receive a response; however, I was arrested the next morning and charged with criminal harassment.

CONFIDENTIAL

My understanding is that the police followed up with Ashley, who then showed them a series of calls from a no-caller ID number, claiming these calls were made by me.[7] There were no text messages, voicemails or caller ID to substantiate this claim. The police synopsis stated that it was Ashley who contacted them out of fear, which is inaccurate as it was me who followed up with the police in an attempt to clear my name. When I arrived at the police station, I was promised the opportunity to speak to an investigator and assumed I would be able to show the police Ashley had called me 30 times in the preceding days[8] or that she had been proactively communicating with my friends about the situation (despite police having told us not to contact one another).[9] However, I was not allowed to tell my side of the story (which would have exonerated me) and was held in a holding cell over the weekend and my mobile device was seized.

---

[5] George Clements, "***Relationship Status***" (09 May 2024) via text message **[communicated to Ashley Thornton]** <> **[***In these communications, I am explaining my thoughts on our relationship and expressing my need for someone who values me***]**.
[6] *R v Clements*, 2024 **(Statements, Isaac Francis**; **Jeremy Nichole-Williams**; **Elaina Hameed**; **Naomi Dsilva**; **Yoann Emian**; **Max Teitelbaum)**.
[7] *R v Clements,* 2024 **(Document Index**, "**Arrest Based on Private Number Calls and Charter Rights**").
[8] Ibid, **(Document Index**, "**Ashley Thornton Calls**").
[9] Ibid, **(Document Index**, "**Ashley Thornton's Proactive Communication**"; "**Proactive Communication II**").

The police claimed the purpose of seizing my mobile device was to extract call logs to prove I had called Ashley. However, after receiving my disclosure, no such call logs were included. This situation ripped my entire world apart. I was scared and did not know what to do. I had just graduated from law school and was about to begin my articling term, and now I found myself charged with a criminal offense I believed I did not commit. While I acknowledge that I was far from a perfect partner to Ashley, but it is clear that this is a situation spiraled out of control, and I recognize my role in enabling it. It is not my intention to cast Ashley in a negative light; I still think Ashley is a good person and she is very talented. However, this was a bad situation and some of her actions were wrong.

Police Complaints

It is imperative to explain that the complaints against the Toronto Police Service were not part of a litigious vendetta. Rather, this was a strategic decision, as the Crown has a duty to consider police misconduct, and I needed a way to ensure that my evidence would be properly reviewed and considered.[10] This had to be done because the initial portrayal of events by the police was significantly skewed against me. By creating this record the Crown was obligated to review the context and circumstances more carefully. Furthermore, the act of filing a complaint signifies to the Crown that there are potential substantial issues with how the initial investigation was conducted.[11]

CONFIDENTIAL

Defence Counsel

As mentioned in the document index, I do not think my defence counsel was the right fit for me. Mr. Morton and I disagreed on some aspects of the case and some uncertainties arose and I am still unsure about what truly transpired. Despite this, I have no intention of ever speaking about the specifics of this matter. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Morton and appreciate his efforts very much. It is important for me to move forward from this and maintain a sense of professionalism and respect for a senior member of the criminal law bar. Although, he did steal my money and was working with the police against his own client. From the moment Howard was recommended to me, I had my suspicions. First, he was referred by someone in Nova Scotia. Second, Howard's background as the former director of the Special Investigations Unit ("***SIU***") and a former prosecutor raised concerns, as I worried, he might have strong ties to the police. These suspicions deepened when he dismissed the relevance of police misconduct in my case. It struck me as odd that someone who had once overseen investigations and prosecutions into police misconduct would tell me it was not relevant. What solidified my mistrust, however, were the Freudian slips he made during our conversations, where he revealed personal and confidential information about me that I had never shared with him. Lastly, he asked me for an additional **$1,000** the day after I had opened a **$1,000** credit card (which may have just been a coincidence). These interactions led to my discomfort and left me questioning his intentions and impartiality.

---

[10] Ministry of the Attorney General, *Crown Prosecution Manual*, (**Toronto**: Crown Attorney's Office) at **D 29**: Police, Allegations of other police misconduct online: **<www.ontario.ca> [perma.cc/QHW5-UJ8G]**.
[11] Supra note 7 **(Document Index**, "**Withdrawal of Police Complaints**").

Confidentiality & Document Submission

One point I want to note is that I understand there is an inordinate amount of information contained in the document index I created, in particular, information such as conversations with another member of the summer class, and a member of the legal talent team. This was to demonstrate that: (**1**) Ashley contacted my co-workers contrary to her claims, and (**2**) I was committed to maintaining transparency and honesty. It is important for the firm to know that this decision was considered in advance. I understand the reputational risks associated with implicating a firm in a criminal court document, which is why my submissions to the Crown were in the form of a *document index*. In Ontario criminal cases, index books are the sole document that is not accessible to the public.[12] This approach allowed me to ensure that certain information would remain confidential while still allowing me to advocate for myself and provide context and evidence to support my innocence.

Key Takeaways/Lessons Learned

I hope—if nothing else—the firm values the upfront and honest manner in which I tried to handle this situation. This is the absolute last thing I wanted to have to come to my employer about right before articling. However, a week before this incident occurred, I was having coffee with a mentor who explained to me that one of the most important aspects of this job is building trust with the people you work with. As such, I wanted to start my legal career off on the right foot; although I regret that this trust-building had to take this form. While I unequivocally deny the accusations made by Ashley, I am not oblivious to my own faults and recognize that I am not blameless in this situation, I made decisions that led to this outcome. For example, not set proper boundaries, and perhaps did not value myself enough to walk away from a relationship that was becoming detrimental to my well-being and professional life. This experience has taught me the importance of establishing boundaries and identifying and removing myself from situations and relationships that do not serve me.

CONFIDENTIAL

Additionally, I must say, this has been one of the most stressful situations I have ever encountered (*to date*). That said, navigating this ordeal has equipped me with a heightened sense of resilience and the skills necessary to manage the stress of an articling term more effectively. I want to reiterate that I am deeply sorry for any concerns/disruption this caused, and I sincerely hope this incident has not jeopardized my ability to article with the firm this year. Working for Norton Rose Fulbright has been a dream come true. Specifically, I genuinely appreciate and value the relationships I have been able to build with my co-workers and other members of the firm. However, I would love the opportunity to demonstrate to other members of the firm whom I have not interreacted with as much, that I can produce high-quality work and be a supportive and reliable colleague.

---

[12] Ministry of the Attorney General, *Courts and legal procedures* (**Access court files, documents and exhibits**), (Toronto: MAG, 28 June 2022) at 2.3 Index books online: **<www.ontario.ca> [perma.cc/VQC4-AUC6]**.

Respectfully,

Your Name

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
General Information and Background		
1.	**George Clements: *Professional and Personal Background***	This document provides an overview of George Clements' educational achievements, professional experience, volunteer work, and accolades. It also traces his journey from foster care to earning three university degrees: a Bachelor of Business Administration, a Juris Doctor, and an MBA. The Crown should consider how the pending charges could affect George's professional future and livelihood. Given his community contributions and budding legal career, the impact on his long-term opportunities should be carefully weighed.
2.	**Bail Conditions and Release Order**	This document is a release order from the Ontario Court of Justice concerning George Clements, who faces a criminal harassment charge. It details his release conditions, including a ban on contacting or communicating with Ashley Thornton, maintaining a five-meter distance from her, and a prohibition on possessing any weapons.
3.	**Disclosure of Legal Situation to Employer**	This document is an email exchange between George and a member of the legal talent team at a Bay Street law firm. In the email, George requests a meeting to discuss the matter. Despite being advised by the police not to disclose the matter to my employer, I felt that it was the right thing to do because I value honesty and transparency.
4.	**Disclosure of Criminal Charge to Law Society**	This document is the Good Character Amendment Form submitted by George to the Law Society of Ontario regarding his recent arrest and charge of criminal harassment under section **264(1)(2)(b)** of the *Criminal Code*. Despite his lawyer, Howard Morton's advice, not to disclose the charge, George chose to report it due to the hybrid nature of the offence **(*Reporting criminal charges or convictions — rr 7.1-3, 7.1-4.4 and commentary; By-Law 8, s 2*).** Upon George requesting written confirmation of Mr. Morton's advice not to report because no obligation existed, Mr. Morton explained that he could not provide written confirmation because his advice was based on a one-time courtesy consultation from Law Society of Ontario Bencher Murray Klippenstein, who indicated to Mr. Morton that no reporting duty existed. Nonetheless, George opted to disclose the charge because he values honesty and transparency.
5.	**Counselling Report**	A letter from a registered counselling therapist was sent to the Crown, confirming that George Clements was under Hunter's professional care from February to April 2024. During this time, they addressed issues related to George's intimate partnership. The letter highlights George's concerns about the criminal charge and its impact on his future, notes his financial difficulties until he begins his articling position, and mentions his decision to cease contact with Ashley, expressing his intent to move forward

CONFIDENTIAL

		and build a healthy new relationship.
6.	THE UNSUITABILITY OF PARS PROGRAM	George completed the intake questionnaire and consent form for the Partner Assault Response (PARS) program. However, after filling it out, he felt the program might not be appropriate for him, as he did not harass Ashley. The detailed intake form, covering aspects of George's personal, professional, and social background, as well as his mental health and past experiences, led him to question the program's suitability.
7.	LINKEDIN POST HIGHLIGHTING GEORGES' ACHIEVEMENTS	In a LinkedIn post, George Clements announced his graduation with a combined JD/MBA degree and a business degree earned over seven years. The post highlights his accomplishments, leadership, and respect within the legal community, garnering nearly 800 reactions from legal professionals across Canada, the US, and the UK. This strong engagement underscores George's positive impact and standing within the community, reflecting his resilience and determination. Given Ashley's close knowledge of George's struggles and achievements, her actions at this critical point in his career raise questions.
8.	R V CLEMENTS DISCLOSURE	The documents outline allegations against George Clements, with the primary focus on an accusation of obsessive and harassing behaviour toward Ashley, particularly centered around a phone call. The documents include detailed notes, victim statements, and police reports, along with a risk assessment by the Family and Domestic Unit of the Toronto Police, which indicates that George poses little to no risk. Notably, the disclosure lacks evidence of George actually making this call. Even if the call had occurred, the pattern of communication—unanswered calls, no voicemails, and Ashley's phone being on silent—undermines the claim that it could constitute harassment.
9.	CROWN CHARGE SCREENING SHEET	The Adult Charge Screening Form outlines the charges against George Clements and the Crown's intent to proceed. The Crown will seek a suspended sentence and probation in the event of an early guilty plea and will also require a DNA sample if a guilty verdict is reached.
10.	SEARCH WARRANT	The search warrant authorized the search and seizure of a white iPhone belonging to George, believed to contain evidence of George calling Ashley. The warrant specified the offense and outlined the types of data to be searched, including communications, media files, and device usage logs. Despite these specifications, no call logs showing George calling Ashley were extracted from the iPhone. This presents a potential issue, as the warrant's justification hinged on finding this specific evidence, and its absence could call into question the necessity or appropriateness of the search.
VICTIM (ASHLEY)		

CONFIDENTIAL

1.	**Ashley Thornton Calls**	This document is a detailed log of phone and FaceTime records between Ashley and George in the days leading up to the incident. The records show frequent and persistent contact initiated by Ashley, including incoming and outgoing calls, with details on date, time, duration, and contact information. Notably, many of Ashley's calls came from a private or unidentified number. This pattern of repeated communication suggests that if George had made a call to Ashley the day after the incident, it would not have been unexpected, or alarming given the prior interactions.
2.	**Ashley's Instagram Post While Police Were on Scene**	Ashley was posting on Instagram while simultaneously calling the police on her ex-boyfriend and filling out police reports. This behavior is undeniably sinister, as it raises serious concerns about her intentions and the authenticity of her claims. Engaging in social media activity during such a critical and supposedly distressing situation could suggest that her actions were calculated or meant to serve an ulterior motive, rather than a genuine call for help. The posts cast doubt on her state of mind and prompt troubling questions about the potential manipulation or exploitation of the situation for reasons other than safety.
3.	**Ashley's' LinkedIn Engagement with Georges' Co-workers**	Text messages between George and Michelle reveal that during their breakup, Ashley engaged with George's co-workers on LinkedIn, despite never having met her. This contrasts with Ashley's claims that George contacted her colleagues (he did not).
4.	**Ashley's LinkedIn Engagement with Georges' Co-workers Part II**	Further confirmation from Michelle Nkansah that Ashley Thornton did contact her via Linked which Michelle describes as "**so weird**".
5.	**November 2023 Breakup Texts Between George & Ashley**	Text messages between George Clements and Ashley Thornton from November 26, 2023. In these messages, George clearly states that he broke up with Ashley because he felt betrayed and believed she was not prioritizing the relationship. This document serves as supporting evidence that George initiated the breakup, contrary to Ashley's claims.
6.	**Ashley's Intimate Partner Violence**	Admission by Ashley Thornton of stalking Naomi and expressing a desire to slap her because she follows George on Instagram. This behaviour is problematic and constitutes intimate partner violence as it demonstrates jealousy, control, and a willingness to engage in physical violence. Such actions contribute to a toxic and abusive relationship dynamic, highlighting the emotional and psychological harm inflicted on both George and the others involved.

CONFIDENTIAL

7.	**ASHLEY'S HARASSMENT AND THREATS AGAINST NAOMI**	Ashley Thornton admits to stalking Naomi Dsilva and expresses a desire to "***slap her***" because she follows George on Instagram. These actions are highly problematic and demonstrate controlling and harassing behaviour. The messages reveal Ashley's attempts to monitor and influence George's interactions with other women, which constitutes intimate partner violence. It is concerning that Ashley engaged in such behaviour while George is the one charged with harassment. These messages were exchanged between Ashley and one of George's romantic partners whom Ashley had reached out to, highlighting the manipulative and abusive dynamics in Ashley's actions.
8.	**TRANSCRIPTS OF CONVERSATIONS WITH ASHLEY**	Conversation between George Clements and Ashley Thornton. The conversations provide insights into the relationship, revealing George attempting to address issues calmly and asking Ashley to leave when conflicts escalate, and she refuses. Ashley dismisses George's concerns, accuses him of running away from problems, and downplays incidents of public embarrassment and physical abuse. George expresses feelings of being misunderstood and emphasizes that he has never and would never physically harm Ashley, contrary to her accusations.
9.	**DISMISSAL OF RACIAL CONCERNS**	During the breakup, George asks Ashley to consider how her actions affect him as a Black man living in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He expresses concerns about feeling disrespected and the impact her actions have on him. Ashley responds by saying that George has a "***distorted view of life***" and cannot see beyond his perspective.
10.	**PROACTIVE COMMUNICATION**	Ashley's proactive decision to message Elaina Hameed about the situation suggests she did not feel threatened or view any potential communication as unwelcome. This context supports the argument that even if George had called Ashley, it would not have been perceived as harassment.
11.	**ACCESS AND MISUSE OF PHONE DATA**	George confronts Ashley about going through his phone without permission, using old information against him months later, and lying about when she discovered it. He points out that once he realized her actions, she began accusing him of harassment. Ashley's response is dismissive.
12.	**DEMAND FOR SNAPCHAT DATA**	George tries to address Ashley's concerns and explain the technical difficulties he faces in retrieving the Snapchat data she requested. Throughout the conversation, Ashley accuses George of being untrustworthy and dragging his feet. George, expressing emotional distress and frustration over their relationship dynamics, attempts to lighten the mood with a joke about Ashley bringing her corporate energy to Bay Street—an ironic comment given the serious fallout between the two when Ashley got to Bay Street. Ashley's responses are dismissive and demanding, contributing to a controlling dynamic in the relationship.

CONFIDENTIAL

13.	TRANSCRIBED STATEMENT OF ASHLEY WITH COMMENTARY	The transcribed statement of Ashley Thornton details incidents of alleged harassment and erratic behaviour. However, a line-by-line analysis, supported by counterevidence, disputes or disproves most of Ashley's claims. This evidence suggests a pattern of manipulation, misrepresentation, and deceit in Ashley's account. Ashley's statement that she ended the relationship appears inconsistent with the facts.
14.	RELATIONSHIP STATUS	Messages between George and Ashley reveal that George communicated his desire to end their exclusivity, stating that they could remain friends but that he wanted to be with someone who values him. Ashley responded with emotional anger towards George's decision.
15.	FEBRUARY BREAKUP INITIATED BY GEORGE	The email correspondence contradicts Ashley's claims, showing that it was George who ended the relationship in February. In the exchanges, George expresses love for Ashley but cites unresolved conflicts and feeling disrespected as reasons for the breakup, stating that he felt Ashley did not prioritize the relationship. Ashley responds with hurt and disagreement, refusing to acknowledge any faults on her part. Her dismissive attitude towards George's concerns, along with her questioning of his commitment, suggests an unwillingness to engage in constructive dialogue and a tendency towards manipulation.
16.	GEORGES' CANCELLATIONS OF SIGNIFICANT EVENTS IN FEBRUARY	A series of declined invitations from George to Ashley for events such as brunch with her and her mother, an anniversary date, a discussion, and a sleepover indicate that George made the decision to end the relationship in February, contrary to Ashley's claims.
17.	MISREPRESENTATION OF COFFEE INCIDENT	Contrary to Ashley's claims that George "freaked out" and threw his coffee in an elevator, text exchanges reveal that George dropped his coffee and was crying, indicating emotional distress rather than aggression. When Ashley described the incident as a tantrum and said George ran away, he clarified that he left to get space from her. This suggests that Ashley's portrayal of the event as violent is inaccurate and misleading. Additionally, Ashley's persistent messaging, even after George requested space, shows a disregard for his boundaries. Her accusations and pressure, coupled with the mischaracterization of events, indicate emotionally manipulative behaviour.
18.	ACCUSATIONS OF ABUSE AND MANIPULATIVE DYNAMICS IN THE RELATIONSHIP	George confronts Ashley about a troubling pattern in their relationship where she consistently portrays herself as a victim and seems to seek out abusive scenarios. He notes that when she tries to provoke fights and he does not engage, she later accuses him of abusive behaviour, even when he has done nothing. George expresses his confusion and frustration over being cast in a negative light, stating that Ashley frames their interactions in a way that makes him appear to be an abuser, despite his efforts to maintain a healthy relationship.
19.	GEORGES' RESPONSE TO	George expresses frustration over feeling verbally and

CONFIDENTIAL

	Emotional Harassment and Ashley's Control Attempts	emotionally harassed by Ashley, leading him to block her and seek space as a coping mechanism. While he tries to communicate respectfully, George mentions that he has sometimes felt compelled to block Ashley for his well-being and to avoid escalating arguments. In response, Ashley demands that George never block her or turn off his location, regardless of how he feels. Her refusal to acknowledge his need for space and her insistence on controlling his actions reflect a pattern of manipulative and controlling behaviour, prioritizing her needs over his boundaries.
20.	**Insecurities and Control Issues in Relationship Dynamics with George**	George discusses the relationship dynamics around social activities, explaining his need to focus on his studies as a law student and his shifting priorities as he approaches graduation. He clarifies that his reduced interest in going out and partying with Ashley is not personal, but rather a reflection of his current stage in life. However, Ashley interprets this as a lack of interest in spending time with her, expressing insecurity and concern. She also disapproves of George's choices, such as travelling to places like Ibiza, attempting to control and restrict his activities based on her own feelings. Ashley's need for constant reassurance and validation of George's commitment creates an unhealthy dynamic, pressuring George to continually prove his affection and undermining his autonomy.
21.	**Mischaracterization of Actions**	In her statement, Ashley claims that George harassed her by dropping items off at her house. However, in email exchanges, George clarified that he wanted to respect her space and was not pressuring her for a reconciliation, even stating that Ashley didn't need to respond if she felt uncomfortable. Additionally, George makes it clear that someone else, not him, dropped off the gift, contradicting Ashley's claim.
22.	**Ashley's Negative Reaction to Georges' Mental Health**	George explains to Ashley that he deleted his social media to focus on his mental health and take a break. Instead of expressing concern or support, Ashley reacts angrily, accusing him of blocking her and escalating the situation. Her response disregards George's mental health and shifts the focus to accusations, creating unnecessary conflict while George is studying for the Bar exam. Ashley's reaction prioritizes her insecurities over George's well-being, exacerbating an already tense situation and undermining constructive communication.
23.	**Coercive Control and Emotional Manipulation**	George expresses deep emotional distress, accusing Ashley of manipulative and coercive behaviour. He explains that he feels broken by what he describes as "hidden abuse," where Ashley disguises harmful actions as support, leaving him emotionally scarred and uncertain about his future. Despite his pleas, Ashley dismisses his feelings and continues the behaviours he asked her to stop, ignoring the impact on his mental health. This pattern, where Ashley appears supportive but disregards George's boundaries, is an example of coercive control, undermining his emotional stability and causing him to question his own

CONFIDENTIAL

		perceptions.
24.	**Emotional Abuse and Manipulative Behaviour**	Ashley becomes increasingly angry and demanding when George doesn't immediately respond to her texts and calls. She accuses him of being disrespectful and intentionally upsetting her by walking away and ignoring her. Despite George expressing that he needed space due to feeling disrespected and abused, Ashley continues to bombard him with messages, demanding communication, and an apology. She insists that George's actions, including walking away and not responding, are abusive, disregarding his need for space for his well-being. Her relentless messaging and accusations create a stressful and controlling environment, pressuring George to comply with her demands. This behaviour exemplifies emotional manipulation, as Ashley twists the situation to make George feel guilty and responsible for her emotional state, even when he is trying to set boundaries.
25.	**Misuse of Police Threats by Ashley**	The document details an incident during the breakup when Ashley threatened to call the police on George after he expressed dissatisfaction in their personal life. It argues that this was an abusive tactic used by Ashley to intimidate and exert control over George. Additionally, the document highlights other actions by Ashley, such as blocking George, and then threatening to involve the police when upset. These behaviours are described as abusive and may provide context for the current situation.
26.	**Shattered iPhone Incident**	A photo of George's phone from the incident at Ashley's Toronto apartment shows the device shattered after it was thrown when George refused to give Ashley access to it.
27.	**Insensitive Joke About Calling the Police**	This document details a conversation between George and Ashley, where George expresses concern and frustration over a joke Ashley and Paige made about calling the police. He emphasizes the seriousness of the issue, particularly because Paige had previously called the police on him, an action that could have had severe consequences. George explains that dismissing his concerns and joking about such matters undermines his experiences as a Black man, especially given the potential dangers of police involvement in the context of systemic racism. Despite his efforts to convey the gravity of the situation, Ashley's responses show a lack of understanding and sensitivity.
28.	**Inappropriate Contact**	This document outlines Ashley's inappropriate actions in adding and messaging one of George's intimate partners on Snapchat. It highlights her disregard for privacy and boundaries by intruding into George's current relationship.
Police Conduct		
1.	**Rebuttal to Police Synopsis**	This document takes a line-by-line approach to refuting statements made by the police and Ashley in the synopsis. Specifically, the document highlights inconsistencies and provides supporting evidence to support inaccuracies in the

CONFIDENTIAL

		account of the evidence. The supporting evidence includes text messages and details such as Ashley's building layout, as well as an Instagram post made by Ashley while police were on the scene. The supporting evidence demonstrates that George and Ashley began dating in February of 2023, not December 2022, and provides proof that Ashley harvested George's personal information, portraying it as current information and lying about the reason for their breakup, going as far as to claim that she was the one who broke off the relationship when the evidence clearly shows it was George who ended the relationship.
2.	**INACCURATE SYNOPSIS SUBMITTED BY DETECTIVE CONSTABLE VLADISLAV EGOROV**	The document titled "***Synopsis for Plea***," authored by Detective Constable Vladislav Egorov (***Badge No. 11523***) from the Toronto Police Service, 51 Division, Youth and Family Services, portrays George Clements as an obsessed stalker, detailing allegations of criminal harassment, including repeated unwanted communications and unauthorized access to the victim's social media accounts. However, there is a plethora of evidence suggesting that this characterization of George is not accurate. A prudent Detective Constable would amend or relay this information, ensuring that all relevant facts are accurately represented to provide a more balanced view of the situation and to ensure fairness in the legal proceedings.
3.	**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST SUBMISSION TO TPS**	George's request to the Toronto Police Service under the Municipal Freedom of Information & Protection of Privacy Act ("***MFIPPA***"). In the email, George seeks access to records concerning a particular incident and inquiries about the possibility of paying the processing fee over the phone. The communication includes an automatic response from the Toronto Police.
4.	**CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE TPS**	George reached out to Mr. Egorov to discuss the case and provide additional documents that might influence the portrayal of George in the police synopsis. George expresses his understanding of the situation and the role of law enforcement while hoping for a resolution based on the new information.
5.	**POLICE COMPLAINTS**	This is a file containing all four the now withdrawn police complaints.
6.	**POLICE BOARD MEMBER REMOVAL**	I was texting the daughter of former police board member Nadine Spencer. The daughter responds saying her mom is on the board and the board takes complaints seriously, and she will mention it to her mom. The next week, Nadine Spencer is removed from the police board after an urgent city council motion. Keep in mind, at this point, my phone has been seized by the police. It is possible that the police monitored these conversations.

CONFIDENTIAL

7.	**Potential Surveillance Setup: Suspicious Email Aliases Linked to George Clements' iCloud Before Incident with Ashley**	The document reveals unusual email aliases linked to George Clements' iCloud account, with some aliases appearing suspiciously tied to monitoring or spyware services. One of these addresses, labeled as "**pegasus-can@onmicrosoft.com**," is particularly concerning due to its possible connection with Pegasus spyware, a tool known for its use in governmental surveillance operations. Another alias, "**projectforthewebbackgroundservices@onmicrosoft.com**," lacks a clear origin or explanation for its creation. These aliases were reportedly added to Clements' account on March 28, 2024, shortly before an incident involving his acquaintance, Ashley. The timing raises questions about whether these surveillance tools might have been intentionally placed to track or monitor Clements' activity, potentially contributing to a larger setup. Given the capabilities of Pegasus and similar spyware to collect sensitive information and monitor device activity, these suspicious email addresses cast doubt on the authenticity of the circumstances surrounding the incident. This unusual digital activity implies the possibility of external interference, suggesting Clements may have been unknowingly subjected to targeted monitoring or manipulation before the events with Ashley unfolded.
8.	**Unusual Saudi Login Activity on Social Media: *Possible Surveillance or Just Surfing the Hub?***	From February to April, my social media accounts kept getting logged into from Saudi Arabia. Strange, right? 😳, But maybe this is all because I was *surfing the hub* for some premium Mia Khalifa content while I was in Dubai. 😂 Could this all be because my browsing got a little too hot for the House of Saud to handle! 🔥🙈
9.	**Apprehension Under the Mental Health Act: *this isn't punishment Mr. Clements***	Clements explains that he was taken into custody on September 26, 2024, due to a lighthearted conversation about medically assisted dying ("***MAiD***"), which he clarified was not intended as a threat. Despite his assurances and lack of erratic behavior, police proceeded with the apprehension. Clements argues that his detainment did not meet the criteria specified under Section 17 of the *Mental Health Act* and was an overreach infringing on his rights. He further highlights unsettling remarks made by an officer, who repeated, "***This isn't punishment, Mr. Clements***," and "***You're too smart, Mr. Clements***," which Clements perceived as punitive, implying he was apprehended for "***knowing too much***." The letter concludes with Clements' request for a formal review to address potential misuse of the Act.
10.	**Seeking Assistance**	In an email dated June 16th 2024, George reaches out to Myron Demkiw (Chief, Toronto Police Service), Doug Downey (Minister of Justice (Ontario)), and Arif Virani (Minister of Justice (Canada)). In his correspondence George gives his personal background information explaining he is a recent law school graduate and that he has had an unfortunate run in with the police. George attaches

CONFIDENTIAL

		a copy of the police complaints and seeks guidance and assistance from the recipients.
DEFENCE COUNSEL		
1.	REASONS FOR TERMINATION OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION	Email exchange between George Clements and his lawyer, Howard Morton. In this exchange, George requests that Howard adhere to the Law Society of Ontario ("***LSO***") guidelines, particularly regarding retainer agreements and additional retainer fees, citing specific rules from the LSO's Rules of Professional Conduct. George also questions how Howard obtained confidential information, such as details about his accommodations.
2.	EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING PARS ENROLLMENT	The email correspondence between George, his lawyer Howard Morton, and Assistant Crown Attorney Thomas Goddard discusses George's contemplated enrollment in the Partner Assault Response ("***PARS***") program, despite his reservations about the charges against him. George expresses concern about being labelled as an abuser and the impact on his mental health, emphasizing that he was the one assaulted by his partner, not the other way around. He asks Howard to inform Mr. Goddard of his situation and to advocate for the withdrawal of the charges, citing their lack of merit and the unique circumstances of his case.
3.	REQUEST FOR POLICE RECORDS AND FOLLOW-UP CORRESPONDENCE	An email exchange between George and Howard Morton. George requests Howard's assistance in obtaining records from the Toronto Police Service's privacy and access to the information department to support the notion that the Toronto Police Service may have been targeting George. Howard responds, by saying he did not know which records George was referring to. Howard was sent an authorization form for the release of personal information and a detailed request for records related to incidents involving George and the Toronto Police Service (attached).
WITNESS STATEMENTS		
1.	ELAINA HAMEED STATEMENT	Details Elaina Hameed's perspective on the relationship between George Clements and his ex-girlfriend, Ashley Thornton. Initially, George's friend, Elaina, began texting with Ashley after Ashley reached out to her. However, after Ashley called the police on George, Elaina realized the situation was problematic. Elaina describes the relationship as toxic and abusive, with Ashley overreacting to minor issues and creating a hostile environment. She recounts specific instances of Ashley's manipulative behaviour and emphasizes that George has never been abusive. Elaina also mentions an incident where a joke by George led to an overreaction by Ashley, resulting in a police report. Elaina notes that Ashley was posting happy pictures on social media while filing police reports, indicating manipulative

Confidential
CONFIDENTIAL

		behaviour. Elaina concludes by vouching for George's character and suggesting it would be best for him to move on from the toxic relationship with Ashley.
2.	**JEREMY NICHOLE-WILLIAMS STATEMENT**	Statement of Jeremy Nichole-Williams where he shares his concerns about Ashley's behaviour, which has caused George considerable distress. Jeremy notes George has sought his counsel on how to distance himself from the relationship with Ashley due to her unpredictability, and reactions to minor things, particularly social media. Jeremy vouches for George's character and highlights his leadership roles and community involvement. Jeremy concludes that Ashley and George have a misalignment in values and George needs to reevaluate his relationship with Ashley for his own well-being.
3.	**ISAAC FRANCIS STATEMENT**	Statement of Isaac Francis who has been friends with George for over 10 years provides a personal account of George's character describing him as a wonderful and well-liked individual. Isaac notes the difficulties George faces during the breakup despite the challenges, Isaac notes George's admirable qualities and expresses his hope that George can move forward and have a happy life.
4.	**MAX TEITELBAUM STATEMENT**	Max Teitelbaum, a lawyer and long-term friend of George for over four years shares his observations based on conversations with George. Max details the serious issues in George and Ashley's relationship, including Ashley's overreactions and accusations of infidelity. He recounts how Ashley's actions caused George significant emotional distress, such as blocking contact, demanding access to social media, and undermining George's relationships. Max describes an incident where Ashley allegedly assaulted George during a confrontation, leading to his arrest. He emphasizes George's efforts to reconcile despite the emotional turmoil caused by Ashley. Max concludes by expressing concern for George's well-being, noting that Ashley's behaviour has caused significant stress. The statement supports George's character, portraying him as a kind individual affected by a toxic relationship.
5.	**YOANN EMIAN STATEMENT**	Yoann Emian, a long-term friend of George, former Francophone Director for the Black Law Students' Association of Canada and Lawyer for the Law Society of Ontario discusses his observations on the relationship between George and Ashley. Yoann, a friend and colleague of George, describes Ashley's controlling and emotionally abusive behaviour, which caused George significant distress. He details incidents where Ashley's actions disrupted George's professional and personal life, including arguments during work events and erratic social media behaviour. Yoann notes that George was emotionally and physically affected, losing significant weight and becoming visibly stressed. In May 2024, Yoann describes an incident where Ashley called the police on George, became physically violent, and demanded his phone. Yoann concludes by emphasizing George's compassionate and

CONFIDENTIAL

		respectful nature, expressing concern over the toxic and abusive relationship with Ashley.
6.	NAOMI DSILVA STATEMENT	Naomi Dsilva's account regarding her interactions with George and his ex-girlfriend, Ashley Thornton. Naomi describes how she met George on a dating app in March 2024 when George first moved to Toronto and that the two began texting. She states that George was upfront and honest with her regarding his recent breakup with Ashley, expressing concerns about Ashley's controlling behaviour and attempts to sabotage his future relationships by contacting George's intimate partners and intimidating them. In mid-April, Naomi states that she received numerous follow requests on Instagram from user @ashley.thorntonn which she eventually accepted. She states that Ashley also contacted her on Snapchat, (screenshots provided), asking intrusive questions about George, which Naomi found strange and controlling. Naomi confronted George, who denied Ashley's allegations and said that Ashley was trying to ruin his life by spreading false information. On May 11, 2024, George and Naomi reconnected, and George told her that Ashley had called the police on him after an argument where she verbally and physically abused him. George asked for Naomi's help, given her firsthand experience dealing with Ashley's controlling behaviour and harassment. The statement includes evidence of Ashley's attempts to monitor and influence George's relationships, such as following and messaging Naomi and other women connected to George. This behaviour is photo evidence of the harassment and coercive control exerted by Ashley, which is particularly troubling given that George is the one facing harassment charges.
CROWN & CHARTER CONSIDERATIONS		
1.	INITIAL INFORMATION SENT TO THE CROWN	Highlights evidence and arguments from George Clements to refute claims made by Ashley Thornton in the police synopsis. George clarifies that he and Ashley began dating in February 2023, not December 2022. He disproves Ashley's accusations of harassment and hacking by presenting text messages showing that Ashley accessed his device and used his information to defame him. George explains that he initiated their breakup in November 2023 and attempted reconciliation in December, contradicting claims of post-breakup harassment. Text messages reveal George's willingness to give Ashley space, disproving her portrayal of him as obsessive. Additionally, security measures at Ashley's residence indicate that George could not have visited uninvited. The document also notes that George was the first to contact the police, countering the narrative that Ashley sought police intervention due to harassment.

CONFIDENTIAL

2.	**ARREST BASED ON PRIVATE NUMBER CALLS AND CHARTER RIGHTS**	The police charged George Clements with criminal harassment and seized his cell phone based on his ex-girlfriend, Ashley Thornton, receiving calls from a private number. This occurred after George attempted to follow up regarding Ashley's assault on him and his wrongful citation. The arrest and seizure were carried out despite the absence of voicemails or any direct evidence linking George to the calls. Arresting, charging, and seizing someone's phone solely based on calls from a private number, without verifying the source or asking the accused for any explanation or counterevidence, does not constitute reasonable and probable grounds. Such actions violate Section 8 of the Charter, which protects against unreasonable search and seizure. This failure to meet the legal standard of "reasonable and probable grounds" necessary for law enforcement to intrude upon an individual's privacy and liberty highlights a significant breach of George's rights, making the arrest unlawful. This is especially egregious in contrast to the fact that Ashley called George about 30 times in the preceding three days, yet he was the one charged with harassment.
3.	**COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW AND REASONS FOR REMOVAL OF COUNSEL IN R V CLEMENTS**	This document presents an extensive overview and the rationale behind the removal of counsel in the case of *R v George Clements*. It includes detailed email correspondence between George and various parties involved in the case, such as Mr. Thomas Goddard, Assistant Crown Attorney. The document highlights key legal and procedural issues, including the appropriateness of limited-scope retainers, the professional conduct of defense counsel, and concerns about impartiality and procedural fairness. Additionally, it discusses the implications of peace bonds, evidential considerations, and the potential impact on Mr. Clements' professional future. The correspondence reflects Mr. Clements' advocacy for his legal rights and his requests for accountability and transparency within the judicial process.
4.	**CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THE CASE R V CLEMENTS: *DISPUTING ALLEGATIONS AND SEEKING RESOLUTION***	Email exchanges between George and Thomas Goddard, an Assistant Crown Attorney, concerning the ongoing legal proceedings in the case of *R v Clements*. In these emails, George expresses his deep distress over the accusations made against him by Ashley Thornton, highlighting that the claims are exaggerated or false. He specifically mentions that Ashley accused him of criminal harassment and making her fearful, but George refutes these allegations, asserting that his actions were neither criminal nor threatening. George provides additional context, explaining that Ashley's claims, such as him throwing coffee and her breaking up with him, are not accurate. He states that he dropped the coffee accidentally and that he was the one who ended the relationship. George is concerned about the severe impact these accusations are having on his life, including his mental health and professional future. He emphasizes his desire to resolve the situation, expressing that he wants to move on and live a normal life without these legal challenges hanging

CONFIDENTIAL

		over him.
5.	**CROWN EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE — DAVID LUTZ**	It appears that Mr. Thomas Goddard, Assistant Crown Attorney, is actively inhibiting George's ability to retain effective legal representation. In the exchange where George is asking Mr. Goddard to call Mr. Lutz, Mr. Goddard claims he could not take a phone call due to a supposed "***security upgrade***" to his work issued device. This comes despite the fact that Mr. Goddard has consistently advised George to speak to duty counsel throughout the proceedings and after George has lost his initial lawyer due to Howard Morton conspiring with the police against George. However, now that Mr. David Lutz, one of the most experienced criminal lawyers in the country and someone who has known George since childhood is offering to step in and assist, Mr. Goddard suddenly claims he is unavailable, refusing to engage at a critical time in the proceedings. Mr. Goddard's reference to a phone security upgrade raises serious questions. We can reasonably infer that this excuse may stem from frustration related to the police's inability to extract call logs from George's phone due to the security settings on his device. However, to retaliate by withholding communication and creating obstacles for George to obtain effective legal counsel is profoundly unjust and a breach of George's Charter protected rights and may constitute an abuse of process. George's security settings should not be used as a basis to punish him or to disrupt his right to a fair process by impeding his access to legal representation. The actions of Mr. Goddard are not only legally questionable but ethically and morally concerning potentially bringing the profession into disrepute and reflecting negatively on the Toronto Crown. Mr. Lutz has expressed his willingness to travel to Toronto and defend George, given his extensive experience in criminal law and his personal connection with George. By obstructing this, Mr. Goddard is not just creating unnecessary hurdles; he is compromising George's ability to have a fair defense and undermining the justice system's core principle: *the right to counsel* (**Section 10 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms**). This goes beyond simple administrative issues; it is a form of obstruction that can have serious consequences for the fairness of the proceedings. It is important that George (a self-represented litigant's) legal rights be respected, and that any personal frustrations or evidence issues on the part of the Crown should not impede with his ability to secure competent legal counsel. A phone "***security upgrade***" should never be an excuse to disrupt such a fundamental right, especially when such matters are easily resolved or deferred for the sake of ensuring due process.
6.		In response to concerns raised, Mr. Thomas Goddard has asserted that he cannot impose a common law peace bond in this case because Ashley Thornton is not currently before the courts and has not been charged with any offense. However, this

CONFIDENTIAL

	MUTUAL COMMON LAW PEACE BOND DRAFT PROVISIONS	interpretation of the law is misguided. A common law peace bond is an exercise of the court's common law jurisdiction, and as such, does not require the individual to be charged or to appear before the court. The only requirement is that there is an admission of a reasonable apprehension of a potential breach of the peace. Mr. Goddard's advice is therefore incorrect, as this legal remedy is available in circumstances where there is concern over future harm, regardless of whether charges have been laid. Additionally, Mr. Goddard's reluctance to impose a peace bond on Ashley is particularly concerning given his previous willingness to impose one on George, despite having no concrete evidence of a crime being committed. This double standard is unjust and highlights a discrepancy in how each party is being treated. If a peace bond was deemed necessary for George, despite a lack of evidence, it is only fair to consider the same action for Ashley when there is evidence. The draft agreement between George Clements and Ashley Thornton includes several important provisions aimed at maintaining peace and preventing future disputes. These provisions include: (**1**) No direct or indirect contact between George and Ashley, (**2**) Both parties are required to maintain a distance of five meters from each other, (**3**) Harassment, intimidation, or threatening behavior towards one another or any future intimate partners is strictly prohibited, (**4**) The incidents leading to this agreement are not to be discussed by either party, (**5**)Communication through third parties is not allowed under any circumstances, (**6**) Both parties are required to protect each other's personal information and are prohibited from misusing any such information, (**7**) Neither party is permitted to pursue further legal actions related to these incident, (**8**) This agreement has a term of six months, after which its terms may be revisited if necessary. Given these provisions, which are designed to ensure the safety and well-being of both parties, it is clear that the common law peace bond could serve a similar purpose, providing an additional layer of legal protection to prevent future breaches of the peace. Mr. Goddard's stance, therefore, is not only legally inaccurate but also unfair, particularly when considering his prior willingness to impose similar conditions on George without the appropriate level of evidence. It is essential that this matter is approached with consistency, fairness, and respect for the legal rights of all individuals involved. Disregarding the applicability of a common law peace bond in this instance only serves to undermine the principle of equality before the law.

CONFIDENTIAL

7.	**EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE ON LESSER AND INCLUDED CHARGE OF HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS CHARGE - R V CLEMENTS**	Despite Mr. Goddard now being fully aware and in possession of evidence that George's actions did not rise to the level of criminal activity as required by the legal precedent he provided to George, he continues to pursue the case. There is no evidence supporting the necessary elements of the offense for harassment, and, moreover, new evidence clearly demonstrates that even if George had engaged in the alleged conduct, it still would not constitute harassment under the law. This persistence to prosecute, despite the lack of evidence and the fact that the legal standard is not met, constitutes an abuse of process. The Crown has an obligation to consider the potential innocence of the accused, and it is incumbent upon them to act fairly and justly in assessing the viability of the case. However, Mr. Goddard's decision to proceed despite knowing the weakness of the case suggests that this is becoming an instance of ambitious prosecution, where the goal may be to force a conviction or penalty despite the lack of legal grounds. In the email correspondence between George and Mr. Goddard regarding the lesser charge of harassing communications, George presents a strong argument that even if the alleged phone calls had been made, they do not meet the standard for harassment. Ashley's phone was set to "***Do Not Disturb***," which means the calls would not have even caused her phone to ring, thus negating any potential claim of distress or harassment. Furthermore, George highlights the fact that mutual communication existed between the two parties, further weakening the case, as harassment generally requires a pattern of unwanted and one-sided communication. George also points out that the case does not align with the precedent provided by Mr. Goddard, which clearly sets a higher threshold for what constitutes harassment under the law. As a result, George requests that the charge be withdrawn, citing the lack of evidence and the failure to meet the legal standard. Despite these clear arguments and the presence of exonerating evidence, Mr. Goddard continues the case, raising serious concerns about the fairness of the prosecution. This situation is emblematic of the Crown's duty to discontinue proceedings when there is no reasonable prospect of conviction. Continuing this case despite the demonstrated lack of evidence violates this duty and is imposing stress, time, and financial costs on George, who is now forced to defend himself against baseless allegations.
8.	**R V SABINE, NEW BRUNSWICK COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH**	Leading case provided by Goddard discusses the interpretation of harassing communications. Made 14 silent calls to security guard. Court had to determine whether silent calls could be considered harassment without verbal communication. The judge noted that harassment could indeed occur through repeated phone calls if the caller does not speak as the act of causing the phone to audibly ring repeatedly can be seen as a form of harassment.

CONFIDENTIAL

9.	**PROOF OF DO NOT DISTURB MODE ON ASHLEY'S PHONE**	The document contains a log of calls and highlights a section indicating that the phone associated with Ashley Thornton had notifications silenced, suggesting it was on "***Do Not Disturb***" ("***DND***") at the time of the alleged calls. This is a crucial detail in understanding the context of the alleged harassing communications. Firstly, DND mode would prevent Ashley's phone from audibly ringing or causing notifications to appear during the calls. This is significant because the legal precedent for harassment provided by Goddard, requires that the recipient to be annoyed by the audible ring of the calls or that they cause some level of disruption. If her phone was on DND, the calls would not have triggered any audible ringing or notifications, which directly challenges the argument that the calls constituted harassment. In the absence of any immediate awareness or disturbance, it is difficult to assert that the calls caused distress, as required under harassment laws. Secondly, the DND mode also offers a legal explanation for why multiple calls may have been made in quick succession. When a phone is in DND mode, it sometimes allows repeated calls from the same number to bypass the silent setting, which is designed for emergencies. This could explain why multiple calls were made in a short period, without any malicious intent, as the caller may have been unaware that the phone was silenced and believed the calls were not going through. This pattern of repeated calls is common in situations where the caller is trying to ensure the call is received, especially in instances where communication is typically mutual, as was the case between George and Ashley. These facts strongly support the argument that the calls do not meet the legal threshold for harassment as discussed in the precedent. Without any audible ringing or notifications and with a reasonable explanation for the repeated calls, the basis for the harassment claim is significantly weakened. Given these considerations, continuing the case on the grounds of harassing communications would be an overreach, as the necessary elements of the offense are clearly not present.
10.		In an email to the Trial Coordinator at 10 Armoury, Mr. Thomas Goddard discusses the scheduling of a continued Judicial Pre-Trial ("***JPT***") session with Mr. Justice Fraser. The email outlines the timeline of the case, upcoming court dates, and the decision to move forward with a trial. However, despite Mr. Goddard's claims that the case could not be reassigned in a reasonable time, it is clear that this assertion is inaccurate. Mr. Goddard could have easily ensured the case was reassigned, allowing George to have a pre-trial before October, which would have expedited the resolution of the case. Instead, Mr. Goddard is using the Crown's discretion to ensure that the charge is not dropped, fully aware of the significant personal consequences this delay is causing George. George is set to start work soon and faces the real risk of homelessness if this matter is not resolved in a timely fashion.

CONFIDENTIAL

	R v Clements — JPT Scheduling Correspondence	By refusing to reassign the case and allowing the delay to persist, Mr. Goddard is prioritizing procedural control over the fundamental fairness owed to George, who is entitled to a timely resolution. Had the case been reassigned, the proceedings could have moved forward without unnecessary delays. The Crown's failure to act has effectively stalled the process, leaving George in a precarious situation. Mr. Goddard could have, and should have, taken the necessary steps to avoid this prolonged delay, but instead, he chooses not to, knowingly compromising George's ability to defend himself and causing undue hardship. Later, George followed up with Mr. Goddard asking for guidance on how to file a Notice of Appeal in light of these continued delays and injustices. Rather than providing clear instructions, Mr. Goddard dismissively responded, stating that George was "misunderstanding many things," offering no meaningful assistance. This unhelpful and dismissive response further exemplifies Mr. Goddard's unwillingness to ensure that George's rights are respected and shows a clear lack of interest in facilitating a fair and timely resolution to the case. It is evident that Mr. Goddard is using his discretion in a manner that appears more focused on controlling the case's timeline than ensuring justice. The Crown has a duty to balance the interests of the justice system with fairness to the accused, and in this case, that balance is being neglected, resulting in deliberate delays that have serious implications for George's future.
11.	**Withdrawal of Criminal Charges**	Outlines withdrawal of charges against George Clements. It contains information such as personal details, name, date of birth and address. Specifies the nature of the charges initially brought (criminal harassment), as well as the formal withdrawal of the charge against George. The document also lists the history of court dates and decisions leading up to the withdrawal of the charges providing a record of the judicial proceedings.
12.	**Resolution Correspondence**	Email correspondence between George and Mr. Goddard revolves around resolving the case, including potential peace bond options and the chance to participate in a counseling program, alongside George's apprehensions about public records and the impact on his future professional life.
13.	**Application for Variation or Cancellation of Peace Bond Term**	Application filed in the Ontario Court of Justice by George Clements, requesting a variation or cancellation of Term 2 of the common law peace bond entered on August 1st. The specific term mandates the completion of the "***Just for Today***" counselling program by November 1st. The application is grounded on financial hardship, as Mr. Clements is unable to afford the program, and it highlights alternative counselling efforts that fulfill the bond's rehabilitative aims. The application aims to prevent an unintentional breach of the peace bond due to financial constraints.
14.	**Request for Case Review**	This document is an email from George Clements addressed to Thomas Goddard and the South Toronto Crown, with a copy to

CONFIDENTIAL

	AND MENTAL HEALTH CONSIDERATIONS [*JUSTIN TRUDEAU*]	various other authorities, including the Attorney General and the Ministry of Justice and Justin Trudeau. The email, dated June 27, 2024, details George's request for a review of a pending criminal charge against him. In the message, he explains that his mental health has significantly improved since severing contact with the complainant, Ashley. He describes how he has focused on personal growth, including studying for the bar exam, pursuing professional development, and engaging in activities that improve his well-being. George also refutes allegations of drug abuse, stating that he does not have a substance use problem, and emphasizes that he is not trying to damage Ashley's reputation. He expresses frustration with the Crown's refusal to accept his choice of counselor, highlighting the cultural relevance of his counselor to his background as an African Nova Scotian man. George also questions the validity of the criminal charge, citing inconsistencies in the police report and the Crown's own statement that it does not intend to pursue a conviction. He requests a review of the evidence, including complaints against the police, and asks for a reassessment of his case based on these factors.
ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE		
1.	**COURT TRANSCRIPT ORDER AND PROCESSING TIMELINE CORRESPONDENCE [*JANET MCLEAN*]**	Email exchange between George and Janet McLean, a court transcriptionist, regarding the order for court recordings from his court dates. Janet confirms the order has been placed and notes that a rough estimate of the cost will be provided once the recordings are received. She explains that a deposit is required before the project can begin and mentions that the due date of September 30 may not be feasible due to potential delays in awaiting approvals from the judge.
2.	**REQUEST FOR COURT RECORDING — R V CLEMENTS — JUSTICE CHAPMAN — [JANET MCLEAN]**	Email correspondence of George following up with Janet McLean, a court transcriptionist, regarding his request for court recordings for several court dates. Janet provided feedback from the Toronto Court House's Recording Management team, advising George to revise his order by deleting Justice S. Chapman as the presiding judge and removing the August 1, 2024, court date, which was already transcribed. George was also informed that Adrienne Dela Cruz had completed the transcription for the August 1, 2024, session. George followed up, submitting an updated form and asking if anything further was required to complete the order.
3.	**TRANSCRIPT ORDER REQUEST [*LISA LING*]**	George sent a request to Lisa Ling on September 23, 2024, for a court transcript since he had not heard back from the other transcriptionist. The request covers several trial dates from June 19, 2024, to August 1, 2024, with a particular focus on the July 10th date. George attached the transcript order form and inquired about the procedure for obtaining the transcript. He requested one certified copy in electronic format.
4.	**TRANSCRIPT ORDER REQUEST**	Email exchange between George and Adrienne Dela Cruz discusses George's inquiry about the transcription of various court dates.

Confidential

	[*Adrienne Dela Cruz*]	Adrienne confirms that the August 1st date had already been requested by the? Addario Law Group, and she has submitted the request to obtain the audio recordings for the other dates. George also submitted a completed transcript order form and sought clarification on *why* the August 1st date was already completed.
5.	**Request for Access to Digital Court Recordings [*Justice Fraser*]**	George submitted a request for access to court recordings for the SR-JPT held on July 10, 2024, presided over by Justice Fraser. During this session, Justice Fraser stated that the court no longer had jurisdiction to impose a common law peace bond and noted that the Crown's case lacked sufficient evidence. George explained that he had provided Mr. Goddard with proof that the allegations against him were false. Despite Justice Fraser instructing Mr. Goddard to withdraw the charges if no call logs were included in the disclosure, Mr. Goddard refused to do so, even though no call logs were provided.
6.	**Request for Court Recordings — R v Clements [Janet McLean]**	Outlines the request for court recordings for various dates related to ***R v Clements***, Janet McLean, initially involved as the authorized court transcriptionist ("***ACT***"), informed the Records Management team that she could no longer handle the case due to other commitments. The email exchange also notes that all dates, except July 10th, were previously ordered by another ACT, Adrienne Dela Cruz. The team requested that George be informed of the update and that an amended order form be submitted for the July 10th recording.
7.	**Follow-Up on SR-JPT Order Request [*Justice Fraser & Alexandra Panke*]**	George sends a follow-up email on October 2, 2024, regarding the request for an order from Justice Fraser to allow the transcription the SR-JPT recording from July 10, 2024, in *R. v. Clements*. George included his initial request, the court access form, and a draft order. George noted the transcription is to be handled by Adrienne Dela Cruz. George expressed his appreciation for the assistance he received and outlined the need for the recording to facilitate the transcription process, noting the restrictions under *Criminal Proceedings Rules* 28.05(3) and 28.05(4).
8.	**Request for Court Recordings — R v Clements [*Barb from Recording Management*]**	George emailed Barb from the Toronto Armoury Recording Management team on October 3, 2024, to follow up on his request for the **SR-JPT** court recordings related to R. v. Clements. George had gone in person to the courthouse to get the recording situation figured out and expressed his appreciation for their conversation regarding the process for obtaining the order necessary to transcribe the recordings, noting that the transcription is time-sensitive due to its relevance to an appeal. He attached the relevant request form and requested that the transcription be handled by Adrienne Dela Cruz. George reiterated his gratitude and asked if there were any steps he could take to expedite the process. During their conversation, Barb noted that she believed she may have found the correct form, however, she needed to confirm with her supervisor and would email George back later that day. Barb got back the following Tuesday. George Appreciates Barbs help very much.

CONFIDENTIAL

9.	**URGENT REQUEST FOR COURT RECORDINGS — R V CLEMENTS [ADRIENNE DELA CRUZ]**	Email exchange where Adrienne Dela Cruz communicates with George regarding an urgent request for court recordings related to *R v Clements* on September 27, 2024. Adrienne informs George that, as a self-represented party, he will need a judge's order to access the recordings of certain proceedings, specifically the July 16, 2024, self-represented Judicial Pre-Trial ("***JPT***"). The courthouse confirmed that restricted access requires an official order. George acknowledges and plans to follow up with the necessary steps to obtain the recordings.
10.	**REQUEST FOR ORDER TO TRANSCRIBE SR-JPT RECORDING — R V CLEMENTS [JUSTICE FRASER]**	George submitted a formal letter request to Justice Peter N. Fraser's assistant, Alexandra Panke, on October 2, 2024, respectfully requesting an order to release the digital recording of the **SR-JPT** proceedings from July 10, 2024, in the case of *R v Clements*. This recording is restricted under *Criminal Proceedings Rules*, Section **28.05(3)**, and George is seeking permission to have it transcribed by Adrienne Dela Cruz.
11.	**COURT TRANSCRIPT ORDERS AND PROCEDURES MANUAL**	George reviewed the Court Transcript Standards and Procedures Manual and noticed that it only restricts access to proceedings in the Superior Court of Justice. However, his case took place in the Ontario Court of Justice. George is now uncertain whether the restriction applies to his case.
12.	**INQUIRY REGARDING REQUEST FOR TRANSCRIPTS IN PERSONAL MATTER [*ADDARIO LAW GROUP*]**	This document is a series of email exchanges between George Clements, an articling student, and members of the Addario Law Group, specifically Mr. Addario and Samara Secter, regarding the request for transcripts related to a personal legal matter. George inquires why the law firm requested transcripts for his August 1st court appearance without his knowledge. The law firm declines to provide an explanation for the request. The document highlights George's attempt to clarify the purpose behind the law firm's involvement in his case, as well as the law firm's refusal to disclose why they ordered the transcripts. George responds by saying he understands and wishes Samara a good day ahead.
13.	**EMAIL EXCHANGES — APPLICATION FOR ACCESS TO COURT RECORDINGS – CRIMINAL MATTER OF R V CLEMENTS**	This document contains email correspondence between George Clements, Thomas Goddard (Assistant Crown Attorney), and the 10 Armoury Applications team regarding George's application for access to restricted court recordings. The recordings relate to a Judicial Pre-Trial ("***JPT***") session held on July 10th, 2024, presided over by Justice Fraser. George is seeking access to these recordings for his defense in a case involving the charge of harassing communications. The exchange highlights George's efforts to clarify the process for obtaining these recordings. The 10 Armoury Applications team mentions that the materials have been forwarded to Justice Fraser, and George seeks guidance on whether he needs to arrange a court hearing to access the sealed recordings. He inquiries about the procedure and submits several legal documents to support his request, including Form 1, an affidavit, and a draft order. George is proactive in following up, and the tone of the document reflects a formal attempt to

CONFIDENTIAL

		expedite the legal process while seeking clarity on administrative requirements.
14.	**APPLICATION FOR ACCESS TO COURT RECORDINGS – CRIMINAL MATTER OF R V CLEMENTS**	This document contains a formal application, affidavit, and a draft order filed by George with the Ontario Court of Justice. The application seeks an order for the transcription of the July 10th, 2024, Judicial Pre-Trial ("***JPT***") proceedings before Justice Fraser. George argues that the transcript is crucial for the preparation of his appeal and further legal proceedings related to his case of harassing communications under Section 372(3) of the Criminal Code. The affidavit outlines the necessity of the transcript, as it contains important discussions and rulings that are central to the legal issues being contested. George states that despite attempts to access the recordings, they remain restricted, and he requires a court order to proceed with the transcription. The draft order requests the release of the recordings to a transcriptionist, Adrienne Dela Cruz, and proposes that the costs for the transcription be borne by George unless otherwise determined by the court. The document also includes supporting materials such as an affidavit of service, letters to the court, and the draft acknowledgment of service, which details the parties involved in the case, including the Ministry of the Attorney General and Mr. Thomas Goddard, the Assistant Crown Attorney.
15.	**SPECIAL MOTION FOR FAIR PROCESS AND CHALLENGE TO JUDICIAL BIAS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS**	The document chronicles George's efforts to secure a fair legal process through a special motion for an extension to file an appeal and to challenge a peace bond issued against him. Representing himself, George repeatedly communicated with the Toronto Crown's Special Motions office to clarify procedural requirements, request timely responses, and argue for an extension based on procedural fairness. He cites specific statements from Justice Chapman as indicative of judicial bias, asserting that comments implying a predisposition toward his guilt undermined the impartiality necessary in his case. George describes numerous delays and communication barriers with both Crown representatives and his previous counsel, who he alleges terminated their relationship after George discovered he was colluding with the police. His difficulty in obtaining effective legal representation left him self-represented, despite efforts to engage a new lawyer. George further outlines how the ongoing legal issues have jeopardized his articling position, financial stability, and overall life stability, stressing the direct impact on his career. Throughout his correspondence, he advocates for a fair assessment of his appeal on the grounds of procedural fairness, referencing legal principles of the right to be heard and Natural Justice, and emphasizing that his appeal has an arguable prospect of success given the procedural and substantive issues he has raised.
16.		The document is George Clements' factum requesting an extension of time to file an appeal challenging a peace bond

CONFIDENTIAL

	REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO APPEAL PEACE BOND: GEORGE CLEMENTS' FACTUM	imposed by Justice Chapman on August 1, 2024. Clements argues that various external challenges, including difficulties obtaining legal representation and insufficient guidance as a self-represented litigant, caused unavoidable delays in filing. He details obstacles such as financial hardships, lack of procedural guidance from Crown Attorney Thomas Goddard and duty counsel, and judicial comments he perceived as biased. Clements contends that his application is meritorious, raising substantial issues around procedural fairness, coercion, and natural justice. Clements emphasizes that the peace bond was entered under duress, as he felt pressured to secure his articling position, which impacted his professional future and financial stability. He argues that, based on precedent, the court should exercise discretion to grant an extension in exceptional circumstances where an individual shows a genuine intent to appeal and encounters procedural barriers beyond their control. He maintains that his case meets these criteria, highlighting the potential career and personal impacts if the extension is denied.
17.	**CROWN'S RESPONSE FACTUM**	The Crown's response opposes the application for an extension to the filing deadline, asserting it lacks merit. However, this disregards the actual legal standard, which only requires that the applicant demonstrate an "***arguable issue***" to justify the extension. Additionally, the Crown appears to exploit the limitations self-represented litigants face without access to the CaseCentre system, incorrectly claiming that the applicant's materials exceed the page limit when, in fact, they do not. Recognizing the need to ensure all documents are properly presented before the court, George has decided it is necessary to retain counsel to effectively manage these procedural requirements and strengthen his representation.
18.	**CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**	This document details a series of email exchanges between George, the Superior Court of Justice ("***SCJ***"), Crown attorneys, and court staff regarding the processing and scheduling of application for extension of time to bring a summary conviction appeal in *R v Clements*. The correspondence shows the logistical and procedural challenges associated with the case, including the assignment of multiple file numbers, which were later clarified to **CR-24-10000109-00MO**. George expressed readiness to proceed despite residing overseas in Bangkok, Thailand, and made requests for a virtual hearing, stating the difficulty attending in person. The court provided information on its hybrid hearing policies and technical details to facilitate remote participation. George also asked for confirmation that all necessary documents, including the Crown's responses, were properly submitted to the court. Additionally, he raised procedural questions about

CONFIDENTIAL

		whether to bring an abuse of process application required a "***notice of constitutional question***" is required and inquired about the steps to appeal decisions from the summary conviction appeals court to the Ontario Court of Appeal. the correspondence shows the complexities of coordinating legal processes across jurisdictions and adapting to logistical constraints, while addressing procedural inquiries and ensuring compliance with court protocols. It provides a detailed account of George's efforts to advance his application and seek clarification on key procedural issues.
COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO		
1.	**REQUEST FOR APPEAL BOOKS FROM THE ONTARIO COURT OF APPEAL**	This document contains a formal email exchange between George Clements and the Ontario Court of Appeal's E-File team. George requests appeal books for four specified cases, including their dockets and details. The correspondence outlines the retrieval process, associated fees, and procedural requirements, with responses addressing publication bans and logistics for accessing off-site records.
2.	**REQUEST FOR APPEAL BOOKS - *BRITISH COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEAL***	Correspondence between George and the British Columbia Court of Appeal Records team regarding his request for appeal books related to **CA41882—*R v Sidhu*, Manjit Singh**. The response outlines that materials are stored off-site and will be retrieved and processed as per the court's access policy. The email provides details on associated fees for retrieving, copying, scanning, and sending records, while noting that materials except factums are available only in paper format. Payment options and procedural exceptions are also addressed.
3.	**REQUEST FOR SUPERIOR COURT TRANSCRIPTS [*SALLY SERHAN*]**	Email correspondence between George and Sally Serhan, an authorized court transcriptionist, concerning George's request for transcripts related to his application for an extension of time in the Superior Court of Justice. The request pertains to hearings held on November 20th and 21st. George sought guidance on the process, including required fees, forms, and estimated timelines for completion. Sally responded with a detailed fee breakdown, offering various delivery options based on urgency: expedited delivery (5 business days) at $8.80 per page for electronic copies, daily delivery (24 hours) at $11.75 per page, and standard delivery (6–10 business days) at $6.30 per page. A deposit was required to begin the transcription process. Once the transcripts were completed, Sally confirmed they were sent for judicial review and would be certified upon approval. George was also required to sign and return forms, including the Certificate of Transcript Order and Certificate of Transcript Completion. Sally clarified her role as an authorized transcriptionist, noting that she was not authorized to provide legal advice and advised George to seek assistance from a lawyer

CONFIDENTIAL

		or duty counsel for legal concerns.
4.	**NOTICE OF APPEAL AND APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL**	Notice of Appeal or Combined Notice of Application for Leave to Appeal and Notice of Appeal. It details an appeal against a summary conviction decision rendered by the Honourable Justice Suhail A.Q. Akhtar in the Superior Court of Justice. Key dates include the judgment of November 21, 2024, and the notice being filed on December 4, 2024, from Pyongyang, North Korea. George is seeking relief for an alleged error in law made by the summary conviction appeals court and an extension of time to file the appeal.
ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION		
1.	**HUMAN RIGHTS LEGAL SUPPORT CENTRE**	George has scheduled for a telephone interview with the Human Rights Legal Support Centre. The interview will last one hour and will focus on discrimination under the Ontario Human Rights Code. He is advised to fill out an attached interview form and provide relevant documents three days prior to the interview. The Centre will provide advice on options for resolving a human rights claim or filing an application with the Tribunal.
2.	**CASE OVERVIEW**	This document provides a case overview from the Human Rights Legal Support Centre ("***HRLSC***") platform. It includes details such as the case number, creation date, client information, and case status, which is marked as active and in the pre-application stage. It also lists six supporting documents, including medical letters, and police complaints.

CONFIDENTIAL

CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT

To Whom it May Concern:

SUBJECT: ***Clarification and Additional Context—Code of Student Conduct***

I was cleared to return to work, but shortly after, Lynn emailed me, stating that someone had reported my involvement in a physical altercation on campus, which led to my being barred from attending graduation.[13] However, the truth is far more interesting: *I was banned from campus for exercising my rights and using my voice*. It is important to note that this situation unfolded during my breakup with Ashley, and the person who reported me, "***Onye***," is one of Ashley's friends.

The purpose of this letter is to formally present a chronological timeline of events concerning the Dalhousie University Code of Student Conduct process that I was involved in. This timeline aims to provide a clear, detailed, and *truthful* account of the events that transpired leading to my ban from campus and subsequent prohibition from attending my graduation. Please find the information detailed below:

MARCH 08, 2024:

CONFIDENTIAL

I travelled to Houston for the NBLSA conference and met up with the BLSA Canada board.[14] That evening, DBLSA had a scheduled executive meeting via Zoom. During this meeting, we were notified that DBLSA won the Dalhousie impact award that I had applied for on behalf of the society.[15] During the call, my co-president, Onye, was sharing her screen, showing the email inbox. From my computer, I mistakenly sent an email with an inappropriate word in the subject line.[16] Unfortunately, the email appeared in the inbox while Onye was sharing her screen, and the entire executive team, including Onye, burst into lighthearted laughter (thinking the error was comical). The outgoing president of BLSA Canada, messaged me asking, "***was it you who sent that email?***" It was only then that I realized I had accidentally BCC'd the email to president@dblsa.com and sent it to president@blsacanada.com, instead of sending both to the DBLSA address. Shortly after, the incoming BLSA Canada President, replied to the email, reminding us to maintain professionalism.

Later, I had a one-on-one conversation with the BLSA Canada President, during which I apologized for my mistake.[17] She graciously accepted my apology, emphasizing that her role is to support us and advising me to ensure it does not

---

[13] Lynn Thompson, "***Conclusion of Matters***" (06 August 2024) via e-mail **[communicated to George Clements]**.
[14] Air Canada, "***Flight AC591 to Houston is delayed***" (08 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[15] DBLSA President, "***Dalhousie Black Law Students' Association Wins Impact Awards***" (08 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[16] Anonymous Sender, "***Cock***" (07 May 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[17] George Clements, "***Quick Chat; Follow up***" (15–19 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to BLSA Canada**].

happen again. I thanked her for her understanding, and with that, the matter was resolved.

March 11, 2024:

On my way back to Halifax, I made a stopover in New York.[18] That evening, I decided to write an apology message to Onye and suggest a one-on-one conversation to discuss the matter. As I was typing the email, I was suddenly logged out of all DBLSA accounts. Panic set in as I attempted to reach out to other executive members, only to be told that they were not permitted to discuss what was happening, which struck me as odd. Two hours later, I received an email from Lorenze Cromwell, informing me that I had been suspended from my role as co-president.[19]

March 13, 2024:

I received an invitation to a Teams meeting[20], which I was informed would serve as my "***disciplinary hearing***," where I would have the opportunity to respond to the allegations against me. At this point, I did not know what specific allegations were being made. When I joined the meeting, I was told that I would now be given the chance to review the allegations. Onye shared her screen and presented a document she had prepared. The document accused me of misappropriating society funds, sending sexually explicit materials to the VP Finance, making unilateral decisions, and "***financially abusing***" the members.

CONFIDENTIAL

I began by addressing the group, saying, "***First off, I want you all to know that I consider each of you, my friends. DBLSA has been my favourite part of law school, and it's really all I have in terms of community.***"

Misappropriation of Society Funds:

This accusation stemmed from a dispute over my request for reimbursement from our VP Finance for the $200.00 incorporation fee for DBLSA. This procedure had been agreed upon in an executive meeting. However, when I submitted the request over Christmas, Onye sent messages in the group chat, claiming that I had no authority to do so. I did not want it to turn into a big argument so I agreed to e-transfer the **$200.00** back until our next executive meeting when we could clarify with everyone present. Regardless, as president, I had the authority under our constitution to request reimbursement for legitimate society expenses, and this action in no way constituted misappropriation. I made this clear during the meeting, but my explanation was not accepted, and prior knowledge of the agreed-upon process was denied.

---

[18] United Airlines, "***Boarding pass and receipt***" (11 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[19] Lorenze Cromwell, "***Official Notice***" (13 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[20] George Clements, "***Accepted: Meeting***" (12 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to Onye Njoku**].

Sexually Explicit Materials:

I started by expressing my confusion, saying, "***I'm really confused by this accusation—what exactly did I send?***" She responded, "***Oh, it was porn.***" I then asked, "***When was this?***" and they replied, "***I think it was like September or something.***" I firmly stated, "***I unequivocally did not do that, but if I somehow did, I apologize, and I will check the emails later.***" At this point, other executive members chimed in, asking for clarification on what exactly was sent. She then said, "***Oh, I think it was an image of a woman, after the meeting with the law foundation.***"[21] After the meeting, I meticulously reviewed every email and piece of correspondence I had ever sent to my VP Finance. At no point had I ever sent anything even remotely inappropriate. Following the meeting with the law foundation, the only message I sent was along the lines of, "***Great work, Kira—your work product is really good.***"[22]

Making Unilateral Decisions:

This issue stemmed from the renewal of our website domain, www.dblsa.com.[23] My VP Finance, Kira, had expressed her desire to switch our domain from our current provider (**Wix**) due to what she perceived as the company's support for Israel. Having lots of Jewish and Palestinian friends, I initially, responded by saying that while I did not think we should make this change based on political reasons, I was open to it if she could find a suitable alternative that would not affect the website considering the upcoming sweater orders that were to be sold via the website. I did not want to be an overbearing leader which is why I gave her the opportunity, I wanted to support her autonomy regardless of my own beliefs. I gave her some time (about a week) to explore options. After this, I followed up with Kira, explaining that the domain needed to be renewed soon and asked if she had found any alternatives. She had no and said she was still looking. When I stressed the urgency of renewing the domain to avoid the website going down, she argued that there were still a few days left. I acknowledged that but emphasized that I had already given her time to find another option, and now I needed to proceed with the renewal to ensure we did not miss the deadline.

CONFIDENTIAL

In the interim, I had already checked and confirmed switching domains was not feasible at this time. I explained this to her as well. I then explained the situation to Onye, who told me to renew it. Since Keira continued to refuse to renew the domain, I used my own money to do it (while we were in class together). I explained this decision, (and Oney's support of this decision) to her multiple times. During the disciplinary meeting, this renewal was presented as a

---

[21] Google Calander, "A***ccepted NS Law Foundation x DBLSA – Quick Chat @ Wed Feb 14, 2024 12pm - 12/30pm (AST) (George Clements)***" (09 October 2023) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].

[22] George Clements, *Dalhousie Black Law Students; Association: 2024-2025 Law Foundation of Nova Scotia – Grant Application* (**Halifax:** Dalhousie Black Law Students Association, 2023) online (pdf): <www.drive.google.com> **[**perma.cc/4DJ6-XBXK**] [Note:** This report was entirely authored by George Clements. Kira McKesey's name was included as a co-author for encouragement and acknowledgment, despite her not contributing to the report's content**]**.

[23] Wix, "***Review Your Domain's Contact Information***" (13 June 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].

"***unilateral decision***." I provided a screenshot of my conversation with Onye, where she instructed me to renew the domain. However, Onye responded by claiming that she was not being serious or that she did not fully understand the context.

Financial Abuse:

When I asked, "***What do you mean by financial abuse of the members?***"—as I had no idea what this could refer to—Onye responded by saying, "***Oh, well, some of these are just things that we think could happen.***"

Subsequent Deliberation:

After I had said what I needed to say, I was informed that they were going to deliberate on the next steps. They left the meeting for about an hour. During that time, I noticed that a poll had been set up in the Teams chat to decide whether to continue my interim suspension. When they returned, they informed me that they had decided to extend my interim suspension. Oddly, the initial email incident was barely even discussed during this meeting.

March 14, 2024:

After hours at the law school, I met personally with two members of the executive team who knew that this entire process was taking a toll on my mental health and wanted to support me. I expressed to them how much I needed their backing, knowing that the allegations against me were untrue. They explained that their hands were tied by Onye and Lorenze's decisions. During our conversation, they also informed me that there had been discussions about sending an email to the general membership regarding the situation. I was shocked and perplexed that they would consider using the society's platform in such a way, especially when the allegations were false. The two members suggested that it might be best for me to resign to bring the situation to a close. I asked if they could confirm whether the email would still be sent if I chose to resign. They assured me they would inquire, and later confirmed that the email would not be sent if I stepped down. That evening, at 1:00 AM, I sent an email to Lorenze, informing him of my decision to resign from the role.[24]

CONFIDENTIAL

March 17, 2024:

After resigning, I thought that was the end of it. However, when Onye and Lorenze heard that I still planned to attend DBLSA events and the general meeting—because it was the only community I have at law school—I received another email from Lorenze. In it, he informed me that they were revoking my rights to communicate, participate, and attend any DBLSA activities. I replied to Lorenze's email, expressing that the tone of his message felt threatening. I responded

[24] George Clements, "***Official Acceptance of Resignation***" (15 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to Lorenze Cromwell**].

with the letter he had sent, along with some suggestions, and signed off as "The DBLSA Bullying Committee," implying that I felt I was being bullied by Onye and Lorenze. Later, Lorenze would claim that my email was an act of harassment.

March 18, 2024:

Onye sent an email to the general membership announcing that I had been suspended.[25] The email stated that they were conducting a "***robust review***" of my actions and emphasized that they did not take this decision lightly. It also encouraged anyone with additional concerns about me to reach out to them. The message portrayed me in a way that made me seem like a criminal. After the email was sent, several people reached out to me, confused about the situation. One person even remarked, "***After reading that email, I thought you had killed a baby.***"

March 19, 2024:

I sent an email to the general membership titled "***In All Honesty***" in an attempt to defend myself.[26] This was in response to the flood of messages I was receiving from members asking what I had done, largely due to the ominous tone of the email Onye had sent. Her email made it seem like I had done something truly heinous, even though nothing had been proven and I had only been suspended.

CONFIDENTIAL

March 20, 2024:

At this point, I felt I had no other option but to reach out to the Dalhousie Student Union ("***DSU***") to defend my reputation. I had thoroughly reviewed all the relevant information, including email logs, Slack data, and other documentation. I concluded that I had not committed any of the actions Onye accused me of during the disciplinary meeting and had evidence to prove it. Additionally, I had proof that she was treating me very poorly and engaging in some of the behaviours she had accused me of. This led to the start of the "***Request for Compliance with DSU Policies***" email thread.[27]

March 30, 2024:

At that point, I had sent an email stating that I would soon provide a formal document detailing the situation. I also mentioned that I planned to share this document with the general members, outlining everything that had transpired, supported by screenshots and evidence. This document was going to be my way of revealing the truth, holding them accountable for their actions—a sort of guillotine, ready to come down and expose the full reality. But, like Maximilien

---

[25] Onye Njoku, "***URGENT: Update Regarding DBLSA Executive***" (18 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[26] George Clements, "***In All Honesty: My Account of Recent DBLSA Events***" (19 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to DBLSA Membership**].
[27] George Clements, "***Request for Compliance with DSU Policies***" (20 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to Onye Njoku, Lorenze Cromwell, Lucie Guibault, DSU Societies & Programming, Danielle Bailey-Heelan, and DSU President Email**].

Robespierre, standing at the height of his power with the guillotine as his instrument of justice, I was preparing to bring the weight of my case against them. I was on the verge of dropping the blade, metaphorically speaking, when Onye reached out, warning me to stop CCing her on these communications or she would file a harassment complaint.[28] I explained that as president of the society against which the complaint was lodged, she was required to be included in these emails. Yet, despite this, the moment I was about to act, everything changed. Shortly after, on March 31st, I received notice that a harassment complaint had been filed against me by Onye and Lorenze, and I was subsequently banned from campus. In that instant, just like Robespierre, when they shattered his jaw to silence him, my ability to expose the truth was taken away. They knew I was about to drop the guillotine on them—reveal everything—and so, they moved first. They used the complaint, and the campus ban to effectively muzzle me, ensuring that I could not bring my case forward or share the full truth with the community.

In the end, much like Robespierre, who faced the very guillotine he once wielded, I found myself at the receiving end of the system I was trying to use to expose them. My voice was silenced before I could even speak, the guillotine blade dropped—on me instead of them.

Following Events:

CONFIDENTIAL

What is particularly interesting about this situation is the campus ban, as I was already living in Toronto at the time and could not have been on campus even if I wanted to be. I informed the Student Code of Conduct office during our meeting that I had moved to Toronto. However, they still felt it necessary to ban me from campus. As you have seen from my email correspondence with the Student Code of Conduct department and other senior members of the administration, I immediately followed up providing evidence that my communications with Onye and Lorenze were not harassment.[29] I made it clear that my communication was in response to a formal university process and did not constitute harassment. Further, I requested a copy of the complaint and did not receive it until a month later after asking four times.[30]

I also stated that the university's Code of Conduct did not apply in this case. The complaint was related to IT and communication systems, and matters related to DSU are explicitly excluded from the jurisdiction of the university's Code of Conduct.[31] However, they did not even acknowledge this email, and the campus ban remained in effect. They even informed me that they would pause the process to allow me to focus on my studies after I stated numerous times

[28] Onye Njoku, "***Fwd: Request for Compliance with DSU Policies***" (30 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].
[29] George Clements, "***CSC Process Update***" (31 March 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to Melissa MacKay, Rick Ezekiel, Mike Burns, Jacob MacIsaac, Lucie Guibault, Abigail Smith, Kim Brooks**].
[30] Ibid.
[31] Melissa MacKay, "***CSC Process Update***" (08 April 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].

the negative impact the process was having on my mental health.[32] Eventually, I was offered an informal resolution, but at the cost of being allowed to attend my graduation.[33] At that point, exhausted from everything and focusing on other priorities, such as studying for the bar exam and my upcoming articling term, I chose to accept it.

Throughout this entire ordeal, there was never any physical altercation or aggressive behaviour on my part. I at no time raised my voice or used foul language in any of my communications (with the exception of my meeting with the Student Conduct Office where I used the *F word*). All my emails were solely in response to the formal processes being conducted. I did not send individual emails in a threatening manner; my communications were strictly related to these official matters.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

George Clements

CONFIDENTIAL

[32] Ibid.
[33] Kerrin Duggan, "***Code of Student Conduct Complaint Follow Up***" (22 May 2024) via e-mail [**communicated to George Clements**].

No.	Document Name	Description
	DALHOUSIE CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT	
1.	DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT - SEPTEMBER 1, 2021	Outlines the policies, procedures, and expectations for student behaviour at Dalhousie University. Sponsored by the Senate and administered by Student Affairs, its purpose is to foster a respectful, safe, and equitable academic community. It delineates students' rights and responsibilities and specifies the various forms of non-academic misconduct, which include harassment, discrimination, disruption, and abuse of process, among others.
2.	DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT - SEPTEMBER 1, 2021	This document contains an email exchange regarding a meeting request sent to George by Kerrin Duggan from Dalhousie University's Code of Student Conduct Office. Kerrin requests a meeting with George on April 1st, 2024, to discuss a Code of Student Conduct Complaint in which George is named as the respondent. The email mentions that Adam Guzowski will attend the meeting to provide support. George replies by stating his unavailability for the proposed time and requests the details of the complaint for preparation. Kerrin suggests an alternative meeting time and confirms a Teams meeting invite will be sent. George confirms his availability. Instead of Adam, Jacob MacIsaac (head of Dalhousie Security) joins the meeting. During the meeting, George is informed the complaint against him arises from two emails sent to Lorenze Cromwell and Onye Njoku. George explains that these emails were part of his self-advocacy to the Dalhousie Student Union and that they were not harassing and were related to a formal university process. George suggests that Jacob (as head of Dalhousie Security), request Dalhousie Information Technology Services ("***ITS***") review the emails to verify whether they were harassing. George states since these emails were sent through a university network, the school could easily confirm the complaint is baseless. George is told that this is not possible, and the formal Code of Conduct process must be followed.
3.	EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING CSC NOTIFICATION LETTER - APRIL 2024	**a.** Follow-up email correspondence from the initial notification meeting between George, Jacob, and Kerrin, Kerrin informs George about the interim measures sanctioned against him due to the complaint. The email warns George that he may not be able to graduate if he breaches these measures. George replies, reiterating that he has not engaged in any harassment and that threatening his ability to graduate from university is an inappropriate enforcement method. George also attaches a Zip file containing all the emails he sent Lorenze Cromwell & Onye Njoku. George compiled these emails by using Microsoft Office Security's e-discovery feature (which he had requested Dalhousie Security do). In a

CONFIDENTIAL

		follow-up email, George mentions completing a recent survey about his mental health, sleeping patterns, and suicide attempts, highlighting his depression and need for support. George notes that he mentioned his depression in the survey and the need for support. George is trying to make a connection to the survey and the chaos in his life inferring that the university's administration is aware of his mental state. George also refers to "***becoming Nova Scotia's most valuable export.***" This statement is made regarding his African Nova Scotian heritage and the financial support he received from the school and province because of this. He is inferring that because he will not be contributing to the economy of Nova Scotia post-graduation, this may be an underlying factor in the animosity he is receiving from the university administration. **b.** Melissa MacKay from the university replies, acknowledging George's concerns and proposing a meeting to discuss the interim measures and available supports, suggesting further meetings to address the complaint. **c.** George responds stating he is not available because he "feels like death". This demonstrates the severe toll this code of conduct process was taking on George's mental health. **d.** Melissa offers to reschedule the meeting and reminds George of the available support resources. **e.** George restates the distress this process is causing him and provides additional supporting evidence to refute the claims and seeks serious proactive engagement on the issues. He again mentions the personal challenges he disclosed in the university survey. **f.** Melissa responds to George acknowledging his decision not to meet. Melissa also notes that the process is only in its early stages and suggests contacting additional support services. **g.** George responds by asking if the university can get his accessibility advisor to respond to him. George had contacted the university's accessibility center to defer assignments and papers because of the strain he was under due to the CSC process and his ongoing breakup.
4.	**CANADIAN CAMPUS WELLBEING SURVEY INVITATION — DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**	The email invites Dalhousie students to participate in the Canadian Campus Wellbeing Survey ("***CCWS***"), coordinated with the University of British Columbia (***It might be interesting to note which member of Dalhousie's senior administration attended UBC as their alma mater***). The email explains that the survey includes questions that may evoke uncomfortable feelings, particularly those related to mental health and suicide risk. It assures students that participation is voluntary and that they can withdraw their data within two months if they choose. The survey results will be used to enhance the programs, services, and initiatives supporting student success at Dalhousie. All data collected will be kept confidential, aggregated, and used

CONFIDENTIAL

		to improve student health and wellness programs. The email domain set up by ITS alias management indicates that this email was sent directly to George. "***Results in aggregate… will be shared…with Student Affairs etc. etc.***"
5.	**NOTIFICATION OF COMPLAINT AND INTERIM MEASURES - DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY - MARCH 31**	The Student Code of Conduct Office sent a document to George restating the complaint filed under the Dalhousie Student Code of Conduct. The complaint alleges that George repeatedly communicated with two members of the Dalhousie Black Law Students' Association executive through email, phone calls, and text messages in March 2024. These messages were allegedly hostile and threatening, thus meeting the university's definition of harassment. The interim measures imposed include (**1**) an immediate ban from the Weldon Law Building, (**2**) prohibition of any contact with Lorenze Cromwell and Onye Njoku, (**3**) a ban on unwelcome communication with any student, faculty, or staff in the Faculty of Law, and (**4**) exclusion from participating in any law-school affiliated events or activities. The document informs George that he can appeal these measures within 10 calendar days by submitting a written appeal to the Provost & VP Academic. Additionally, the document notes that George used profane language during the initial meeting, which he admits, explaining that his frustration stemmed from finding the allegations and the process utterly ludicrous
6.	**REQUEST FOR COMPLIANCE WITH DSU POLICIES - EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE (REASON FOR COMPLAINT)**	**a. March 20th, 2024** George reaches out to Onye Lorenze and law school Dean Lucie Guibault, among others, questioning the process of his resignation, citing it as a breach of DSU policies. George requests that society adhere to the impeachment process as outlined in the DSU policies. **b. March 20, 2024** DSU programming responds to George, acknowledging the complexity of the situation and expressing sympathy for everyone. He states that more evidence is needed and commits to discussing the matter internally before proceeding. **c. March 20, 2024** Email from Danielle Bailey-Heelan president of the Dalhousie Law Students' Society saying she is also willing to support in this matter. **d. March 21, 2024** George confirms the current version of the DBLSA constitution, noting that it outlines specific procedures for managing the executive team. George explains the Constitution requires transparency, due process, and member engagement, particularly for the impeachment process. George notes that any suspension or resignation should be handled openly and fairly, emphasizing the importance of good faith, honesty, and respect. He stresses that actions undermining governance or taking advantage of

CONFIDENTIAL

		a member's vulnerability (George dealing with mental health issues and the decision being made while he was in New York), would violate the underlying spirit and principles of the constitution. **e. March 26, 2024** George is following up on the matter. **f. March 27, 2024** George is following up on the matter. **g. March 27, 2024** Tammy Maniou, VP Internal of the DSU, responds to George's detailed email. She informs him that she will notify the Society Review Committee and share the provided information. **h. March 30, 2024** George expressed appreciation for the steps being taken. He reiterates that the scope of the matter is only whether DBLSA had the authority to force him to resign. George also provides a record of all relevant information and communication with DBLSA members to ensure they can investigate the matter properly. George offers to provide additional information or clarification if needed. **i. March 30, 2024** George notes he will send over a document detailing all the events that occur and that he wants to ensure transparency and will notify the members per the DBSA constitution. (***This is one of the emails the complaint stems from. After sending this email I was notified about the complaint against me***). **j. April 8, 2024** The society review says they have reviewed all information submitted from both sides and decided that George has no case. **k. April 9, 2024** George questions when and where he submitted his statement, as mentioned by the DSU VP Iof nternal Affairs. George then questions what evidence was presented by the society and notes the decision appears to have been made before he had the chance to submit his formal statement of events. **l. April 10, 2024** DSU states that the Society provided the minutes from George's disciplinary meeting, their timeline of events, his resignation email, and subsequent emails he sent to the DBLSA executive team. **m. April 10, 2024** "*I will send over a formal document detailing the events shortly.*" .... **n. April 15, 2024** George follows up on his previous email.

CONFIDENTIAL

7.	**Code of Student Conduct Complaint - March 27, 2024**	The complaints allege that George engaged in ongoing digital harassment through email with the intention to threaten, instigate, bully, and make the complainants feel as uncomfortable as possible for the remainder of the term. The complaint details key incidents, including George's suspension from DBLSA-related activities pending a review of his conduct. In response to this, George sent three emails, resigning from his position on the condition that no smear campaign be lodged against him. Another incident involved George sending an email to DBLSA members, further contributing to the allegations of harassment.
8.	**Critique of CSC Policy Application, Racism at Dalhousie and Request for Determination**	George emails Kerrin Duggan, Manager of the Student Code of Conduct at Dalhousie, regarding the ongoing Code of Student Conduct process. He cites specific sections of the policy, arguing that even if he had committed the alleged actions, the policy would not apply. George references sections of the policy that excludes conduct related to Information Technology ("***IT***") Resources and activities within the domain of the Dalhousie Student Union ("***DSU***"). He expresses frustration over the situation, emphasizing that he has not received a copy of the complaint three months later, which he perceives as unfair. George includes links to ongoing challenges at Dalhousie University, mentioning his involvement in the DBLSA and BLSA Canada letters, which he suggests might be influencing the current situation. In his final email, George requests that the university clarify whether he has harassed anyone, especially considering the context of ongoing criminal proceedings. Kerrin's response lacks specific information and does not address George's request for clarity. Her response is vague, merely stating that outcomes are not predetermined and explaining the determination process, which George perceives as heavily biased by the university's senior administration. He finds her tone dismissive and believes she fails to recognize the seriousness of the situation and how her determination could impact his life.
9.	**Email Correspondence with Dalhousie University's Code of Student Conduct Office - April 2024**	Email discussing the status of the complaint. The code of Conduct office informs George that the process is paused to allow him to focus on his academic responsibilities. They remind him that the interim measures remain in effect. George attempts to clarify that copying Lorenze and Onye on an email to the DSU was intended as a courtesy—not harassment. George apologizes for any confusion or misunderstanding on his part. George once again requests a copy of the complaint noting that it was never provided to him even though the process has been ongoing for weeks.
10.	**Email Explanation of Absence and Request for Guidance - April 13, 2024**	**a.** Heidi checks in with George to see how to get him to engage after missing a group dialogue exercise. She expresses her concern and seeks to understand the situation. **b.** George apologizes for his absence and explains that he is

CONFIDENTIAL

		dealing with a stressful situation related to a Code of Conduct investigation. He states that the investigation has impacted his academic and mental well-being and asks Heidi for guidance on how to proceed. George also references Dr. Ezekiel's research on the effects of stress on students from marginalized groups and students with childhood trauma and the correlation of stress to their academic standing. George links to a targeted ad posted by Dalhousie University to show he understands the importance of collaboration, which is a key theme at Dalhousie, but says he feels unable to collaborate due to the current situation. **c.** Heidi expresses sympathy for the situation and offers a plan for George to complete his assignments. She suggests doing the simulation on his own, watching a sharing circle, writing reflections, and taking it one day at a time. **d.** George thanks Heidi and expresses hope that he can get through this difficult period. **e.** Heidi asks who is helping George navigate this situation. **f.** George explains he has provided evidence that the allegations are false but feels the situation is being prolonged to silence him. He asks for feedback on his summary and plans to complete the assignments. **g.** Heidi offers to mark the simulation and offers flexibility for his assignments. She acknowledges the subjectivity of harassment claims. **h.** George updates Heidi that he is at the hospital to obtain a doctor's note and will send assignments shortly. **i.** Heidi states George should focus on his well-being and send assignments when able. **j.** George asks if she prefers emailed or uploaded assignments. **k.** Heidi prefers to upload and offers to extend the deadline. **l.** George informs Heidi that he responded to an email chain with Densie about the group dialogue exercise. **m.** George thanks Heidi for her support and expresses regret for not being able to participate fully in the course. He hopes his efforts are sufficient to pass and appreciates her kindness. **n.** Heidi informs George that all marks are in, but she cannot release the final grade yet. She reassures him that he has done well and encourages him to rest and look forward to a bright career. **o.** George expresses gratitude for Heidi's understanding and support, acknowledging the challenges he faced. He thanks her for being a highlight of his MBA program and praises her as an excellent professor and researcher.
11.	**FREDERICK EZEKIEL'S THESIS ON MENTAL HEALTH, CHILDHOOD ADVERSITY, AND**	Ricks's thesis explores the complex relationships between mental health, stress, and academic success among Canadian postsecondary students. The research demonstrates that marginalized sociodemographic groups and individuals with adverse childhood experiences are more likely to encounter

CONFIDENTIAL

	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	higher stress levels and poorer mental health, which in turn, affect their academic performance. Rick is an expert on the impact of these factors, and as such, would be aware of how to leverage this knowledge to affect George adversely. This is disturbing considering the prolonged code of conduct investigation.
12.	**DBLSA MEETING WITH MELISSA MACKAY AND RICK [NO LINK]**	While George was on exchange, Onye and Lorenze had a meeting with Melissa Mackay and other senior members of the administration. This meeting was reportedly initiated because the DBLSA had written about racism, and they wanted to discuss how the Student Code of Conduct could be modified to better address such issues. George asked Onye and Lorenze for notes on this meeting, but they informed him that no notes were taken. In hindsight, George wonders what was discussed at this meeting.
13.	**THE OFFICE ASKED ASHLEY TO FILE A COMPLAINT [NO LINK]**	When George returned to Nova Scotia at the end of April, Ashley and he had a conversation about the chaos that had been transpiring. She revealed something quite troubling: during their breakup, the Student Code of Conduct Office had approached her and asked her to file a harassment complaint against him. This is concerning because it suggests the university may have been attempting to manipulate the situation, leveraging the emotional turmoil of a breakup to initiate a formal complaint. Additionally, this raises questions about the fairness and impartiality of the Student Code of Conduct Office if they are actively seeking out complaints against a student rather than responding to those naturally brought forward by students. This is why George is hesitant to authorize Norton Rose to contact his university.
14.	**FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE FROM STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT OFFICE - JULY 2024 [ASHLEY]**	After Ashley assaulted George and threw his phone, he reached out to the Student Code of Conduct Office to see how they would respond when he was the victim and whether their response would be proportionate to how they treated him. George provided detailed information about the incidents, including Ashley's abuse and defamation that occurred on campus. However, the Office responded that these incidents did not meet the jurisdiction or application requirements set out in the Code of Student Conduct. They also noted that since George was no longer a student and the incidents occurred off campus, the code did not apply. The incongruency here is stark. When George explained why the code didn't apply to his situation, the Student Code of Conduct Office completely disregarded his claim. Yet, when he sought support, the Office found reasons why the Code should not apply, despite the new (2024) code explicitly stating that it does apply to conduct off university property.
15.	**COMPARISON OF DISCIPLINARY CASES**	The university has a history of unusual disciplinary cases, such as the one involving Masuma Khan in 2017.

CONFIDENTIAL

16.	"Dalhousie Uses the Code to Silence Activism"	The university has a history of using its Code of Student Conduct to silence activists, particularly those involved in social justice and anti-racism efforts, as seen in cases like Masuma Khan's in 2017.
17.	DBLSA Constitution	Outlines organization's commitment to promoting and assisting Black students in their pursuit of legal education. DBLSA aims to increase opportunities for Black law students, enhance student life, and bridge the gap between the legal community and Nova Scotia's Black community. Key objectives include promoting the welfare and interests of its members, increasing access to legal education, and articulating and promoting their professional needs and goals. The constitution also emphasizes the importance of political, cultural, legal, social, and economic awareness among its members, collaborating with organizations with similar goals, and engaging in outreach initiatives involving Black youth in Nova Scotia.
18.	Academic Correspondence and Code of Conduct Process Issues	Various faculty members regarding his academic standing, course requirements, and concerns about passing a critical class. The emails discuss issues related to the completion of a learning journal and case assignments, feedback from faculty, and accommodations made due to unique circumstances. The document reflects ongoing correspondence about academic integrity, feedback processes, and personal appeals for academic clarity. The interactions indicate that George is navigating these academic challenges while also dealing with the scrutiny of the institution's code of conduct, which complicates his efforts to ensure his academic success and adherence to university policies.
19.	BUSI 6000 Learning Journal Correspondence	Communication involving correspondence related to a learning journal assignment for the BUSI 6000 course. The content includes emails exchanged between George Clements and his professors, Jenny Baechler and Bill Foster, discussing the submission of the learning journal, feedback on the assignment, and concerns about academic integrity regarding the inclusion of hypothetical case reactions and the use of classmates' names. The professors suggest revisions to rectify these concerns, such as removing the problematic sections or making the case reactions fully fictional.
20.	Clements—Individual Learning Diary—Busi6005	The diary captures his weekly reflections, key learning points, and personal reactions to the course materials, case studies, and readings over an eleven-week period. It provides insights into strategic management, organizational culture, leadership, ethics, and other business concepts, incorporating both academic theories and personal reflections. The author participated in the course remotely, citing past experiences of harassment by university professors and the presence of racism within the MBA program at Dalhousie University, which influenced his decision to engage in a remote learning environment.

CONFIDENTIAL

21.	**SEEKING GUIDANCE: CHALLENGES IN DBLSA LEADERSHIP – KIM BROOKS**	Email written by George Clements to Kim Brooks, seeking advice and support regarding a difficult situation he faced while serving as co-president of the Dalhousie Black Law Students' Association (DBLSA). George describes a series of allegations made against him, including accusations of unprofessionalism, financial misappropriation, and inappropriate conduct, which he denies. He explains that he was pressured to resign from his position under the threat of publicizing these accusations, and even after resigning, he fears the situation could escalate into a scandal that could damage his reputation. George expresses his concerns about the impact this will have on him personally and professionally, and his fear of being blamed for unfulfilled responsibilities, such as clothing orders for students. He reaches out to Kim for guidance, emphasizing his desire to leave Dalhousie on good terms and highlighting the challenges he has faced, including feeling unsupported and targeted.
RESIGNATION		
1.	**DBLSA OFFICIAL NOTICE**	Email exchange between George and Lorenze regarding the official notice sent to George. The context of these emails is that the DBLSA executive team met secretly to suspend George while he was in New York dealing with a recent breakup. Lorenze was aware that George was in New York and sent him mental health service links for Halifax.
2.	**REVOCATION OF PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION DECISION AND RESIGNATION [HARASSING EMAIL NOTED IN COMPLAINT]**	Lorenze sends George an email to share the decision and formally suspend him pending a review of his actions. George replied to the email by (**1**) expressing gratitude for the professionalism shown by Lorenze and the support provided regarding mental health resources, (**2**) acknowledging the well-drafted letter and suggesting some changes, and (**3**) clarifying that he is suggesting changes because the closing line referencing George conveyed a threatening undertone. George's responses were professional and aimed at addressing concerns about the language and tone of the communication, and he was not trying to bully or intimidate Lorenze.
3.	**DISCUSSION WITH ASSOCIATE DEAN**	Email exchange between George and Associate Dean Lucie Guibault, discussing a meeting to address recent events involving DBLSA. George reached out to Dean Guibault for support regarding the situation. He detailed accusations made against him, including misappropriating society resources, and sending inappropriate emails, which he refutes. George explained the challenges he faced with reimbursement for legitimate expenses covered out of his own pocket and described an internal power struggle and resistance to any changes he implements. George expressed concern about the impact on his reputation and requested an opportunity to complete the sweater order to avoid students blaming him for its non-fulfillment.

CONFIDENTIAL

4.	**MISREPRESENTATION AND SMEAR CAMPAIGN**	Onye Njoku sent an email to DBLSA members informing them that George Clements had been suspended from his role as Co-president pending a review of improper conduct, as outlined in the DBLSA Constitution. Onye emphasized the seriousness of the decision, stating that the Executive Board was committed to a robust review despite George's resignation on March 14, 2024. This email can be seen as a smear campaign as it publicly highlighted allegations of improper conduct against George without including him in the discussion or allowing him the opportunity to respond. By detailing the suspension and pending review, the email portrayed George in a negative light, implying criminal behaviour and potentially damaging his reputation among DBLSA members and the broader community. The exclusion of George from the email further compounded the feeling of a lack of transparency and fairness, reinforcing the notion that he was being unfairly targeted.
5.	**EXPLANATION AND REBUTTAL OF ALLEGATIONS**	George admitted to an error involving an email with an inappropriate subject line sent from the DBLSA account, for which he immediately took responsibility and expressed deep regret. He explained that after the incident, he was met with an aggressive response from Onye Njoku during a WhatsApp call, where his apologies and explanations about his mental health struggles were dismissed. He detailed how he was locked out of DBLSA accounts and later confronted with various allegations, many of which he disputed with evidence, yet were not adequately addressed by the accusers. Despite initially being told that a professional discussion would suffice, George felt pressured into resigning under the threat of further damaging communications being circulated to the general members. He noted that the actions taken by Onye and Lorenze were not in line with the values, support, and solidarity that DBLSA stands for. George compared the situation to bullying and highlighted a similar incident of mistreatment within the organization where Eni, the VP of Communications, was forced to resign by Lorenze and Onye. He reaffirmed his commitment to the Black Community and DBLSA, expressed his regret for his error, and accepted any corrective measures such as not using the email instead of being forced to resign with two weeks left in the term. He compared the email sent by Onye to a smear campaign intended to portray him as a criminal, which he was told they would not do. After sending this email, numerous people reached out to George offering support and saying the unfairness of the situation.
6.	**CHALLENGING RESIGNATION AND DSU POLICY COMPLIANCE** **[HARASSING EMAIL]**	Contains an email from George Clements to Onye Njoku and Lorenze Cromwell regarding his resignation from the Dalhousie Black Law Students' Association (DBLSA) and the relevant Dalhousie Student Union (DSU) policies. In the email, George highlights that his resignation was based on a suspension that

CONFIDENTIAL

		does not align with DSU policies, as the only formal process available is impeachment, which requires a two-week written notice. He emphasizes that his resignation, given under the false pretense of an unrecognized suspension, is void and calls for proper adherence to DSU procedures. George requests that the correct impeachment process be initiated, reflecting his intent to ensure transparency and fairness in handling the matter. He stresses the importance of following established guidelines and expresses his willingness to work with the others to address the issue in accordance with DSU policies.
7.	**Follow-up Communication Regarding Apology and BLSA Meeting**	This document consists of a series of email exchanges between George Clements and members of the Black Law Students' Association of Canada (BLSA Canada), including the National Chair, and the National President. The emails primarily discuss George's follow-up on an earlier conversation, during which he expressed regret for his actions and extended an apology. In the emails, George conveys his gratitude for the meeting, acknowledges the seriousness of his actions, and commits to improving his behaviour going forward. The BLSA National Chair acknowledges George's apology and reinforces the collective responsibility of fostering a safe and supportive environment within the organization. The conversation reflects an emphasis on reconciliation, growth, and maintaining a positive culture within the BLSA community.
DBLSA Internal Culture		
1.	**DBLSA Meeting Correspondence: Lunch with Chika**	Emails between George and Prof. Michelle Williams discuss organizing a lunch meeting with Chika to incorporate the society. The emails demonstrate that Onye was (**1**) fully aware of the decision to incorporate, despite later claims that she was not and never agreed to it, and (**2**) that George acknowledged and respected his co-president's view when she informed him that she was no longer comfortable going forward with the incorporation.
2.	**DBLSA Funding and Reimbursement Issues**	Emails between George and Kira Mckesey discuss the reimbursement of expenses for DBLSA's Google Workplace, which George had been funding with his personal funds due to his dedication to the organization. Despite the expense being approved, Kira, the VP Finance, refused to reimburse him, leading George to repeatedly follow up with her. These correspondence highlights (**1**) George's commitment to the organization and (**2**) the unfairness he began to face after his breakup with Ashley.
3.	**Assistance with Moot Competition**	Emails between George and Cindy Kamu, the National Moot Director for BLSA Canada, show George's efforts to help Lorenze and the Dalhousie Moot team. George contacted Cindy to request the resubmission of the factum after Lorenze missed the deadline and made a minor error. George's actions demonstrate his dedication and care for the organization and its members,

		ensuring the team had the best possible experience.
4.	**Forced Out — Eni's Resignation Amid Conflict**	While George was on exchange in the UK, he was unaware that Eni was being forced out of her position on the DBLSA executive team. Eni, who had been George's mentee since before she started law school, was accused of overstepping her role and interfering with others. However, this was not the case, and George later realized there was a concerted effort to remove her.
5.	**DBLSA Flight Reimbursement Struggle**	George submits receipts and boarding passes, seeking reimbursement for the approved $300.00. Despite this approval, Kira, the VP Finance, informs George that the executive team has not yet agreed to reimburse him. George questions why he is not included in these conversations, considering he is the co-president. This highlights the ongoing issues George faced and the divide within the executive team.
6.	**Willingness to Help Despite Difficulties**	Email exchange showing George Clements assisting Kira McKesey with her cover letter and resume for job applications, despite his own challenges, including struggling to be reimbursed for his flight. Kira sought George's help for feedback on her cover letter for a position at BOYNECLARK LLP, and George provided detailed edits and suggestions, demonstrating his commitment to helping his peers. This correspondence demonstrates George's willingness to support and mentor others, even when facing his own difficulties within the organization.
7.	**Continued Support Post-Resignation**	The document is an email exchange showing that even after being forced out, members of the DBLSA continued to reach out to George for assistance with tasks they were unsure how to handle. In this case, Oyebade Sanyaolu contacted George for help with order confirmations and an Excel spreadsheet for the sweater order. George promptly responded, demonstrating his dedication to ensuring everything was accounted for and that members received their orders as expected. This highlights George's ongoing commitment to the organization and his willingness to support his peers despite his own challenges.
8.	**Excel Sheet Sent to Oye**	Link to the Excel sheet sent to Oye, which includes a pivot table that organizes and categorizes the orders.
9.	**Corporations Canada Correspondence**	Email exchange between Corporations Canada and George Clements regarding the incorporation of DBLSA. George asks them to resend to a new email address. It is important to note that throughout this correspondence the president@dblsa.com email was bcc'd each time, to maintain transparency and keep all parties informed. I set the internal email routing settings so that each time an email was sent or received it was sent to an internal server which redirected it to all members so that everyone was in the "know". This means Onye was fully aware of the ongoing incorporation process, which she later claimed she was not.
10.	**Sweater Order Process**	The document is an email exchange between George Clements,

CONFIDENTIAL

		Onye Njoku, and Linda Huang from Coastal Reign, discussing the order process for DBLSA merchandise.
11.	**MEETING DISCUSSION ON RETURN-TO-WORK PLAN**	Discussing a meeting about George's return to work plan after his hospital stay. During this meeting, Onye attempted to make me step down from my position as co-president. Onye again claimed that she did not know about the plan to incorporate even though there is a record of her agreeing to it in the executive meeting minutes. Later, to be funny George addressed a similar situation where Onye had made an expenditure without getting approval. George was trying to show her that they did not need to attack one another and can work together without conflict.
12.	**ORDER FULFILLMENT CONCERNS AND ACCOUNTABILITY - DBLSA CLOTHING ORDERS**	Contains an email from George Clements to the Dalhousie Black Law Students' Association ("***DBLSA***") members, addressing concerns about unfulfilled clothing orders. In the email, George apologizes for the delays and confusion surrounding the orders, which he had ensured were ready for fulfillment before stepping down from his role. He emphasizes that the pending issue is the unpaid invoice for the merchandise, and he had repeatedly communicated with the DBLSA Executive Team to resolve this. George expresses his willingness to personally pay the invoice and manage the order distribution to ensure that everyone receives their merchandise on time. George highlights his efforts to prevent any blame directed at him, especially since Onye, another member, had told everyone it was his idea, making him fearful that the failure to fulfill the order would unfairly fall on him. He emphasizes his commitment to seeing the orders fulfilled, reflecting his dedication to upholding his responsibilities despite the ongoing challenges.
NOVA SCOTIA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION		
1.	**NSHR INQUIRY**	Inquiry form from the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission. It is intended for individuals who believe their human rights have been violated and need to provide detailed information for the Commission to assess their case. The form requires the individual to provide personal information, details about the respondent (the person or organization accused of discrimination), and contact information for any legal counsel or advocate.
2.	**FOLLOW-UP COMMUNICATION REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS COMPLAINT ASSESSMENT**	Email between George and Robyn Martelly, a Human Rights Officer at the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission (NSHRC). The exchange focuses on clarifying the progress and timeline of a human rights complaint assessment (***Case No. 24-1578***). Robyn explains that each case assessment is unique, varying in duration, and George's case is expected to be completed by December. George expresses appreciation for the update and confirms his understanding of the process. The emails highlight the professional and courteous communication between the parties and underscore the NSHRC's acknowledgment of Indigenous and African Nova Scotian histories and contributions

CONFIDENTIAL

		in their land acknowledgment statement.

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
	CORRESPONDENCE WITH EMPLOYER	
1.	**LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AND ARTICLING CONCERNS**	**July 8, 2024** • George updates the firm on the progress of his legal situation, stating that the Crown is not seeking a conviction, and the complainant does not want the matter to proceed. He mentions that he just needs to complete a course, which should allow the case to be withdrawn before his start date. **July 9, 2024** • The firm expresses sympathy for George's situation and wishes him well for the pre-trial meeting. They hope the matter will be resolved favourably, allowing him to put it behind him. **July 10, 2024** • George asks if the recipient has time for a brief phone call. Later, he confirms the time for the call and indicates he will call. The firm attempts to call George but is unable to reach him. George apologizes for missing the call and offers to reconnect the next day. **July 11, 2024** • George and the firm agree on a time for a call. After the call, George follows up, asking if the firm would be willing to write a letter explaining that his ability to start articling depends on the timeliness of the Crown's decision. **July 12, 2024** • The firm confirms that George can delay his articling start until the legal matters are resolved. However, they decline to provide a letter to interject in the legal proceedings. **July 15, 2024** • George thanks the firm for their response and asks if it would be possible to go on secondment during the first rotation of his articling term. He also provides an update on his legal case, mentioning that his lawyer is withdrawing from the case. **July 22, 2024** • George appreciates the firm's support during this difficult time and promises to keep them updated on the proceedings. He looks forward to starting his articling term once everything is resolved.

CONFIDENTIAL

		July 23, 2024 • The firm expresses sympathy for George's situation and mentions that they are not able to offer him employment until the legal matters are resolved. They also offer third-party counselling services if needed. **July 30, 2024** • George informs the firm that police complaints have been withdrawn and that the Crown is willing to drop the charge if he signs a common law peace bond. He asks if this means he can start work on August 6th. **July 31, 2024** • George requests a call to discuss his situation further and expresses confusion about the change in the firm's response regarding his ability to article. The firm responds by acknowledging his transparency but reiterates that no decision will be made until all legal matters are resolved. George thanks the firm for their response and confirms that he will keep them informed once everything is concluded.
2.	**RESOLUTION AND NEW CONCERNS**	**August 1, 2024** • George informs that all legal matters and related issues have concluded, and the charge against him has been withdrawn. He expresses his eagerness to put this behind him and move forward. **August 2, 2024** • The firm thanks George for providing documents related to the court proceedings and informs him that they will review everything further. They expect to reach out to him the following week to discuss the next steps. Later that evening, George acknowledges the response and expresses his willingness to wait for further communication. He wishes them a good long weekend. **August 6, 2024** • The firm reaches out to George, mentioning that they were informed about an alleged altercation at Dalhousie, which may have led to him being prohibited from attending convocation and the campus. They suggest a discussion at 4:00 PM and propose joining the call with another colleague. In response, George confirms the meeting time, clarifies the situation about the alleged altercation, and shares additional information for review. He also expresses disappointment about how the situation affected his dying grandmother, who couldn't see him graduate.
3.	**SCHEDULED MEETING**	This document serves as a confirmation of the scheduled meeting between the involved parties, indicating the intent to

CONFIDENTIAL

		further discuss matters of importance related to George's situation.
4.	**REQUEST FOR SUPPORT**	George reaching out to Kim Brooks, the President of Dalhousie University, expressing his exhaustion from ongoing allegations and his urgent need to start working. He requested that someone at the university be informed about his situation. The email reflects George's frustration and fatigue due to the issues he has been facing. Kim never replies to George.
5.	**REQUEST FOR COMPLAINT FILE AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION CONFIRMATION**	In a series of emails between August 9 and August 12, 2024, George Clements communicates with Dalhousie University's Student Support regarding access to his complaint file and confirmation of disciplinary actions. George requests a copy of the complaint file related to an incident from March and asks for confirmation that this was the only formal disciplinary action taken against him during his time at the university. His employer requires this information due to concerns stemming from George's campus ban and prohibition from attending graduation. In response, the university sends an attached package based on George's request and authorization, asking for his confirmation to proceed with the disclosure. George confirms and later requests a brief meeting between his employer and the university to discuss the complaint further, addressing concerns over the safety of children on campus.
6.	**FOLLOW UP ON DALHOUSIE ACTIONS**	emails between George Clements and his contacts at a law firm from August 7 to August 13, 2024. The emails focus on addressing and clarifying issues related to George's disciplinary actions at Dalhousie University. The law firm expresses concerns about the measures taken by the university, particularly the campus bans and prohibition from attending graduation, and seeks further confirmation and details from Dalhousie. George provides additional information, expresses his frustrations about the situation, and seeks to clear up any misunderstandings. Throughout the exchange, George seeks to confirm the resolution of the complaint, clarify there are no remaining restrictions, and expedite the process to allow him to begin working. The law firm requests that George obtain confirmations from Dalhousie, particularly about the resolution of the complaint and the lifting of any interim measures.
7.	**PRIVACY RELEASE AUTHORIZATION**	Formal letter from George to the Office of Student Conduct at Dalhousie University. In this letter, George authorizes the release of specific, information related to the complaint from March 31, 2024, to his current employer. The request is focused on providing clarity about the circumstances that led to his campus ban and prohibition from attending his graduation. George specifies that the release should include the initial complaint, interim measures, and the terms of the informal resolution. He also requests a formal confirmation that no additional disciplinary actions were taken against him during his time at Dalhousie. The letter outlines strict limitations on the

CONFIDENTIAL

		disclosure, ensuring that only essential information is shared, and details the handling and delivery process for this information.
8.	**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY RECORD RELEASE**	Letter from the Dalhousie University Student Conduct Office to Ms. The contact. The letter confirms that Dalhousie University has received authorization from George to disclose specific information regarding a disciplinary matter initiated on March 31, 2024. The letter includes documentation of the primary complaint, the interim measures that were implemented, and the terms of the informal resolution. Additionally, the Student Conduct Office confirms that no other disciplinary actions or sanctions were taken against George under the Dalhousie University Code of Student Conduct during his time as a student.
9.	**EMPLOYER COMMUNICATION AND RESOLUTION CONFIRMATION**	A series of emails exchanged on August 12 and 13, 2024, involving George, his employer, and the Dalhousie University Student Conduct Office. The discussions center around a complaint filed against George on March 31, 2024, under Dalhousie's Code of Student Conduct. George introduces key members of his employer's team to the Dalhousie representative, proposing a meeting to clarify the details of the complaint and the measures taken by the university. However, after reviewing the disclosure provided by Dalhousie, George's employer decides not to proceed with the meeting and instead requests written confirmation on two points: the resolution of the complaint via informal measures and the lifting of any interim restrictions against George. Dalhousie responds by confirming that the complaint was resolved through an informal resolution and that the interim measures, such as the campus ban, are no longer in effect.
10.	**ARTICLING DISCUSSION CONFIRMATION**	Confirms a scheduled meeting between George Clements and a representative at a law firm on August 13, 2024. The meeting was set to take place from 5:00 PM to 5:30 PM via Microsoft Teams. This meeting was related to discussions surrounding George's articling position, and that he has been authorized to begin his work.
11.	**GRATITUDE AND SECONDMENT INQUIRY**	Series of emails exchanged between George and his contacts at a law firm on August 13 and 15, 2024. George expresses his gratitude for the support he received during a challenging time and his excitement to begin his articling position. He also inquiries about the possibility of creating his own secondment opportunity with another organization or potentially arranging a secondment to another office within the firm. The response from the firm is positive, indicating that arrangements are being made for George's onboarding, and they express their eagerness to have him join the team. The firm also reassures George of their support throughout his articling term.
12.	**ARTICLING START PREPARATIONS**	Email exchange between George and his contacts at the law firm regarding his upcoming articling start on August 19, 2024. The emails discuss final preparations before George begins his

CONFIDENTIAL

		articling position. George confirms his excitement to start and provides the necessary documents, including a headshot, bio, and other requested information. He also confirms that he does not need a loaner phone and has no dietary restrictions. The firm recommends that George arrive around 8:50 AM to settle in before beginning his day, which will include IT setup and training.
13.	**Email Correspondence on Personal and Professional Guidance Requests**	This document is professional email correspondence involving a discussion about personal challenges faced by George who is seeking guidance and support from Lynn Thomson and Lynne O'Brien, the Director of Legal Talent, and Chief People Officer respectively at Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP. George brings various issues to their attention including financial struggles, the impact of the peace bond on his mental health and professional interactions, and concerns over work attire due to most of his professional clothing still being in Halifax. He also mentions at unsettling late-night experience at work and seeks advice on secondment opportunities given his academic achievements. Lynn Thomson responds with empathy offering immediate assistance with the gift card and directing him to the companies Family and Employee Assistance Program. She also encourages further discussion when George feels better and offers flexibility regarding his work attendance. George tells Lynn and Lynne that he feels like he is dying and seeks assistance in the removal of the peace bond pointing to the firms access to justice programs and seeking support.
14.	**Feeling Singled Out Due to Exclusion from Group Photos and Team Recognition**	In Terence Dobbin's post welcoming the firm's articling students back, George Clements might feel singled out due to both the content of the post and his exclusion from group photos. Terence makes a lighthearted comment about one individual managing to "get herself into some of the pictures," which indirectly highlights those who weren't included. For George, who is sensitive about feeling isolated at work, being left out of these team photos could reinforce his sense of being overlooked, especially as he has already expressed feeling excluded for not having a secondment like his peers. Additionally, given the personal challenges he's been facing, the lack of inclusion in the group photos likely exacerbates his feelings of isolation and separation from the broader team, further contributing to his sense of being singled out.
15.	**Initiating the Group Photo Trend**	George Clements was the one who originally started the trend of posting group photos of students, as seen in his LinkedIn post from the previous year. In this post, George enthusiastically shared a picture of himself and his colleagues at Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP after their first week, encouraging others to connect with them for advice or insights. This original post highlights his initiative in creating a sense of community and visibility for the students. However, in recent communications, George has felt left out when similar group photos were posted

CONFIDENTIAL

		without him, leading to feelings of exclusion. Given that he started this tradition, being omitted from subsequent pictures could feel especially disheartening for him.
16.	**Reflection on Access to Justice and Personal Legal Support**	In his correspondence, George Clements highlights the firm's strong commitment to access to justice, as demonstrated through their involvement in initiatives such as Pro Bono Ontario. He acknowledges the firm's dedication to helping those in need and emphasizes how this aligns with their broader mission of providing legal assistance to marginalized groups. However, George questions why the firm seems reluctant to assist him with his specific situation—dealing with the personal and legal challenges related to his peace bond he only entered to start work. Given the firm's commitment to justice and fairness, he wonders why this commitment does not extend to helping him resolve a situation that is severely impacting his mental and professional well-being. This perceived inconsistency adds to his feelings of being overlooked and unsupported, despite the firm's outward dedication to justice for others.
17.	**Firm's Commitment to Employee Support vs. Lack of Personal Assistance for George**	In this email correspondence, Jennifer Teskey, the Managing Partner of Norton Rose Fulbright Canada, emphasizes the firm's commitment to supporting its employees both professionally and personally through the "***Ways of Working***" ("***WoW***") policy. She highlights the importance of in-person collaboration for mentoring, learning, and maintaining firm culture. While the firm claims to prioritize helping employees balance their professional and personal obligations, George Clements has pointed out that despite this stated commitment, the firm has been unwilling to assist him with his personal legal challenges related to his peace bond, making him feel unsupported in a critical area of his life.
18.	**Physical Security Reminder Following Intruder Incident at Work**	The day after George Clements slept on the bathroom floor at work due to an intruder, Bryce Berry, the Chief Information Officer, sent out a reminder email regarding the firm's physical security policies. The email stressed the importance of being vigilant against potential security risks, both digital and physical. It emphasized securing laptops, locking computer screens, following a clean desk policy, and safeguarding sensitive documents. Specific attention was drawn to the potential for intruders, advising employees to be aware of individuals attempting to "***tailgate***" or enter secure areas without proper identification. Employees were reminded to report suspicious individuals and ensure that visitors are always accompanied. This email, while focused on general security, likely resonated with George's recent experience of feeling unsafe due to the intruder at the office. What's interesting is that George hadn't told anyone at work about the incident at the time of this email.
19.	**Firm-Wide Emails Highlighting**	Norton Rose Fulbright Canada's articling student rotation details. George feels singled out by the firm-wide emails, like this schedule, which showcase other students' rotation assignments

CONFIDENTIAL

	Secondments and Rotations Without Inclusion of George Clements	while he is left without a secondment. George feels isolated, and this document visibly reinforces his situation of being the only one without such an opportunity, despite his expressed interest and qualifications. The constant circulation of these schedules exacerbates his feelings of being overlooked or excluded from key professional development opportunities within the firm because of entering a peace bond for a crime George did not commit, and only entered so he could start working.
20.	**Medical Leave and Required Assessment Following George Clements' Disclosure Email**	George Clements was placed on a paid medical leave by his employer, Norton Rose Fulbright, after he sent an email to his articling class explaining his delayed start and other personal matters to avoid feeling singled out. In his email, Clements shared details on recent struggles, including financial difficulties, his damaged laptop, and an incident where he felt unsafe in the office. He attempted to clarify these points in a follow-up email to Terence Dobbin and Lynne O'Brien. The firm expressed concern over his well-being, noting behaviors that suggested a need for health support, and outlined that a medical assessment by a psychiatrist would be required to determine his readiness to return to work.
21.	**Delayed Coordination of Professional Assessment for George Clements with Viewpoint**	The document details communications between George Clements and Chris Marchetti, Senior Manager of Client Relations at Viewpoint, a medical assessment organization, which was arranged to conduct a professional assessment for Clements. The assessment with Dr. Anson Liu was scheduled for October 30, 2024, but the correspondence reveals delays and unresponsiveness on Viewpoint's part. Despite Clements' repeated follow-ups and urgency to complete the assessment by October 21, as requested by his firm, Viewpoint's delayed responses left him with no choice but to travel to Mexico to expedite the assessment process independently. The exchanges include discussions on consent, privacy under Ontario's PHIPA law, the security of the assessment platform, and report redaction requirements for Clements' employer.
22.	**Psychiatric Evaluation Report for George Clements**	George Clements, a 26-year-old male born on November 24, 1982, was evaluated on October 21 and 23, 2024. He reports experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder ("***PTSD***") since March 2024, stemming from issues in a romantic relationship and a harassment accusation, which he claims to be false. This situation has led him to fear potential legal, professional, and moral repercussions. He describes a period of three days without eating, mistakes in work duties, panic attacks, and feelings of isolation. Currently, he presents with anxiety and PTSD symptoms, such as flashbacks and worry about similar events recurring. His mental examination shows him as cooperative, appearing his age, and maintaining good hygiene and grooming. His gait is unaffected, and there are no abnormal movements or distinct

CONFIDENTIAL

		facial expressions. His speech is spontaneous, appropriate in tone, and increased in speed, goal-oriented, and follows directives. His thought process is appropriately paced, though he has recurrent thoughts about the traumatic event and concern for the future, with no evidence of delusions. He denies suicidal thoughts or perceptual disturbances. Diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder ("***ADHD***") (**F90.0**) since age 16, he was previously treated with Vyvanse (lisdexamfetamine) 50 mg/day until August 2024. Additionally, he now meets criteria for PTSD (**F43.1**). Treatment includes Pregabalin 75 mg, one capsule at night, to reduce anxiety. Given his anxiety, stimulant medication for ADHD, such as methylphenidate, is not recommended currently. ADHD-specific treatment may be reconsidered in two months if anxiety reduces to a more manageable level. Despite ongoing PTSD symptoms, he remains capable of self-care without severe risk. He is deemed to be progressing towards improvement, and returning to work is advised. Continued medication for anxiety is recommended alongside monthly psychiatric evaluations. This report is issued at the request of interested parties for any lawful purposes they may require.
23.	**MEDICAL CLEARANCE NOTE FROM ST. MICHAEL'S HOSPITAL - OCTOBER 3, 2024**	George provided medical documentation from St. Michael's Hospital on October 3, 2024, indicating his capacity to return to work. Despite this clearance, his firm insisted on a more invasive psychiatric evaluation before allowing him to resume his position.
24.	**EMPLOYER-DIRECTED PSYCHIATRIC EVALUATION AND CONCERNS OVER IMPARTIALITY: *EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE***	The document consists of email exchanges where George communicates with his employer and other associated parties about his compliance with health assessments required for his continued employment. His employer is attempting to set him up with what is presented as an independent medical evaluation; however, the provider in question is affiliated with a psychiatric service regularly used by the Toronto Police Service. George expresses concern over the neutrality of this arrangement, questioning the impartiality of a psychiatric evaluation connected to law enforcement rather than an independent, unbiased health service. The emails delve into his apprehensions about this affiliation and his preference for a truly independent medical evaluation to ensure his assessment remains fair and uninfluenced by outside entities, particularly those connected to law enforcement.
25.	**TERMINATION AND ALLEGATIONS OF NON-COMPLIANCE: *NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT'S DISMISSAL OF***	The termination letter issued by Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP to George on October 25, 2024, presents a case rife with troubling actions by the firm, resulting in significant career setbacks and raising substantial questions about procedural fairness, transparency, and potential violations of George's

CONFIDENTIAL

	GEORGE	rights. This letter terminates Georges' employment based on what the firm deems "***serious misconduct,***" yet the reasoning and process leading to this decision expose inconsistencies and appear to disregard Clements' efforts to comply responsibly with the firm's requirements. **MISLEADING COMPLIANCE EXPECTATIONS AND WITHHOLDING EMPLOYMENT** Initially, Norton Rose Fulbright communicated to George that he could select any psychiatric provider to fulfill their assessment requirement, seemingly offering him autonomy in choosing a provider that best fit his circumstances. George, eager to comply and mindful of the firm's timeline, chose the firm-suggested provider, Viewpoint, despite delays in scheduling. However, after Viewpoint repeatedly failed to respond and ultimately pushed his assessment date further out, Clements took the responsible step of sourcing his own independent psychiatric assessment outside of Ontario. The independent assessment, which George promptly completed, determined that he was fit to return to work. Despite this assessment fulfilling the initial requirement and showing Georges' proactive compliance, the firm later restricted their conditions, insisting on the Viewpoint assessment as the only acceptable option, claiming that George's choice of an alternate provider constituted non-compliance. This sudden change effectively penalized George for taking independent, reasonable action based on the guidance given to him, creating an unfair standard after he had already fulfilled his duty. The result was an unjust consequence for George, who had trusted the firm's assurance that he could choose an assessment provider, now to be terminated for what amounts to procedural ambiguity on the firm's part rather than any actual misconduct. **INACCURATE ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT** The termination letter further accuses Clements of "***egregious communications***" with firm representatives, which the letter cites as part of his misconduct. However, this characterization seems not only unsubstantiated but also inaccurate, as there is no evidence of George engaging in any disrespectful or unprofessional interactions. On the contrary, it appears George maintained a respectful and professional demeanor throughout his communications, even as he faced significant delays, mixed messages, and obstacles from the firm's appointed provider, Viewpoint. The vagueness of this accusation raises concerns that it may serve as a pretext to justify termination, particularly when no concrete examples of inappropriate communication are provided. This characterization could unfairly tarnish his reputation, impacting his career prospects and potentially

CONFIDENTIAL

labeling him as a problematic employee within a small and interconnected professional community.

Potential Human Rights Violations and Breach of Employment Standards

The firm's handling of George's assessment also suggests possible infringements on his human rights and privacy. The firm insisted on Clements' use of a provider with strong ties to law enforcement (Viewpoint, suggested a psychiatrist commonly used by the Toronto Police Service), rather than a truly independent psychiatric service, which could be seen as an attempt to control or influence the assessment process rather than genuinely supporting his mental health needs. Forcing an employee to undergo an assessment with a provider connected to law enforcement, especially when a private, qualified assessment confirming his fitness for work had already been completed, undermines his right to an unbiased evaluation. This action may also breach employment standards, as employees have the right to autonomy in their personal health choices, especially when they are exercising reasonable judgment.

Further, this handling of Clements' psychiatric assessment could be interpreted as discriminatory, given that the firm seemingly manipulated the assessment process to suit its own aims rather than upholding his rights. The firm's disregard for the independent assessment he undertook demonstrates a potential misuse of power, aiming to create barriers rather than facilitate his return to work. This disregard for fair treatment raises concerns of indirect discrimination, as the firm's actions appear to single him out, using mental health as a mechanism to justify withholding his employment.

CONFIDENTIAL

Severe Career and Personal Impact

The consequences of this dismissal are far-reaching for George, who is now without an articling position—a requirement for legal licensure in Ontario—and thus unable to complete a critical step in his legal career. Given the highly competitive and regulated nature of the legal profession, this termination severely impacts his ability to secure future positions and may effectively derail his career. Moreover, the financial and mental health repercussions cannot be overlooked; he is left without income, professional stability, and potentially without access to critical health benefits. This action also leaves a significant gap in his professional record, which may lead future employers to question his past conduct based on the vague, unproven allegations in the termination letter.

The letter, which insists on "egregious" behavior and "serious misconduct," could have long-term reputational consequences

		for Clements in a field where personal and professional reputation are paramount. The use of these unsubstantiated allegations to justify his termination demonstrates a failure on the firm's part to respect George integrity and conduct fairly. These actions reflect a lack of due process, leaving Clements vulnerable to unwarranted assumptions by potential future employers. **OVERALL CONCLUSION AND CONCERNS** In conclusion, this termination letter from Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP represents a series of troubling actions that cumulatively raise concerns about fairness, transparency, and respect for human rights in employment practices. By terminating Clements on grounds that contradict their initial instructions, the firm has not only destabilized his professional future but has potentially infringed on his personal rights. Clements' efforts to secure an independent assessment when faced with procedural delays from the firm's suggested provider indicate responsibility, not misconduct. However, the firm's response—changing the requirement, disregarding his efforts, and issuing vague allegations—suggests an attempt to sideline him under questionable pretenses rather than support his reintegration into the workplace. This document reveals a power imbalance that places an early-career professional at an extreme disadvantage, jeopardizing his livelihood, career progression, and mental health. The firm's handling of the situation reflects an approach that prioritizes procedural control over individual rights and fairness, casting serious doubt on their commitment to employee support and ethical standards in workplace management.
26.	**DISMISSAL WITHOUT DIALOGUE: EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GEORGE CLEMENTS AND JEAN-CHARLES RENÉ ON TERMINATION AND COMPLIANCE MISCOMMUNICATION**	The document features an email exchange between George and Jean-Charles René, General Counsel at Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP, on October 25, 2024, concerning Clements' unexpected termination. George, having followed the firm's directive for a psychiatric assessment, questions the decision to terminate him. The emails reveal a deeply frustrating exchange for Clements, who took the initiative to obtain his own evaluation when the firm's designated provider, Viewpoint, was unresponsive and repeatedly postponed his assessment. Although his independent evaluation confirmed he was fit to return to work, Norton Rose Fulbright dismissed his compliance and cited his proactive action as non-compliance, leading to his immediate termination. Jean-Charles René, in his responses, maintains a starkly unyielding tone, refusing to address George's concerns and deflecting all responsibility by simply stating, "Our letter speaks for itself." Rather than engaging with Clements' valid points—

CONFIDENTIAL

		namely, that he followed the instructions he was given, sought a timely resolution to the assessment requirement, and acted professionally throughout—René chooses not to provide further explanation, leaving Clements in a state of confusion and frustration. George even explicitly mentions the firm's prior assurance that he could choose any provider if the assessment was completed promptly, which René ignores entirely. In this exchange, René's dismissive attitude toward Clements' efforts reveals an underlying disregard for both transparency and employee support. George is left not only without an articling position but also without clear answers, despite having gone "***above and beyond***," as he put it, to meet the firm's stated requirements. This approach by René exemplifies a lack of empathy and respect, disregarding Clements' attempt to understand the basis for his dismissal and leaving his career and mental well-being in jeopardy. René's curt responses and refusal to engage meaningfully with Georges questions show a troubling approach to employee relations that prioritizes rigid adherence to procedural control over fair treatment and support.
27.	**PROFESSIONAL CHARACTER AND CONDUCT REFERENCES PROVIDED TO NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT CANADA**	This document is a list of professional character and conduct references for George Clements, detailing various individuals who can attest to his character, work ethic, and professionalism. The references include a range of colleagues, mentors, and associates from different organizations and backgrounds, such as law students, lawyers, and corporate professionals. Each entry provides a brief description of how George knows the person, the nature of their relationship, and highlights specific positive traits or actions that the individual can speak to regarding George's character and work. The document is intended to serve as a comprehensive compilation of George's professional network and the strong relationships he has cultivated throughout his career and education.

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE LAW SOCIETY OF ONTARIO		
1.	FOLLOW-UP COMMUNICATION REGARDING INFORMATION REQUEST	George had a call with Maggie in which she requested additional information. Due to the LSO portal being down during the implementation of LSO Connects, George sent the information via email on September 16, 2024. He followed up on September 20, 2024, with an updated version due to some links being inaccessible.
2.	CLOSE NOTICE, GOOD CHARACTER, TO LAWYER APPLICANT	The Law Society of Ontario ("***LSO***") informed George that based on the information he provided in his Licensing Application and Good Character Amendment Form, they will not pursue a good character investigation. George disclosed extensive details about the criminal harassment charge, and the Dalhousie University investigation, which was resolved as of August 13, 2024. The LSO reminded him of his ongoing obligations as a Licensee and Applicant.
3.	RESPONSE LETTER TO LSO REGARDING GOOD CHARACTER REVIEW	George responds to the LSO's October 1, 2024, letter concluding the good character review. He clarifies that while the criminal harassment charge was withdrawn, he accepted a common law peace bond related to a lesser charge of harassing communications. He also discloses past charges from his youth under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* stating he stole food after running away from a group home, and an adult assault charge stemming from a bar fight after racist comments were made about him. Both incidents were resolved, and he expresses deep regret for these past actions, and states they are not indicative of his character or fitness to practice law.
4.	CONSULTATION ON INCREASED TRANSPARENCY – LICENSEE REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE	George provides feedback on the proposed changes by the LSO regarding increased transparency and public disclosure of criminal charges for licensees. He expresses concerns that these changes could disproportionately impact licensees from marginalized backgrounds, such as those from lower socio-economic communities and racialized groups. George suggests alternative approaches to protect the public while maintaining fairness, including focusing on convictions rather than charges and implementing criminal record checks.
5.	FOLLOW-UP SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS TO LSO	George emailed the Law Society of Ontario's Licensing Process department on October 11, 2024, to follow up on a document submission deadline. Due to issues with the portal, he submitted his documents via email to ensure compliance by the October 12th deadline. He attached his Notices of Assessment ("***NOAs***") for 2021, 2022, and 2023, along with details regarding his line of credit. George noted that some of his university-provided tax slips were amended after he filed his returns, requiring him to mail an update for his 2021 return, as the CRA's online system didn't support this amendment. Additionally, he provided

CONFIDENTIAL

		updated information on his financial status, including the principal balance of his line of credit (excluding accrued interest) and a new **$1,000** CapitalOne credit card, which remains at a zero-balance due to an activation issue. The attachments are password-protected for security, and Clements offered to share the password once the portal is back online. He notes that interestingly over the summer, one of his tax returns was somehow amended on its.

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
CORRESPONDENCE WITH DALHOUSIE HEALTH & WELLNESS		

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
CORRESPONDENCE WITH CAPREIT		
1.	EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE ON THE STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL OF GEORGE CLEMENTS' PERSONAL BELONGINGS	The document is an email exchange regarding the handling of George Clements' personal belongings at a storage facility. Clements is informed by Ashley Helle, a legal coordinator, that his belongings are taking up multiple lockers and are being held until a specified date. Helle emphasizes that after this deadline, the items will be discarded if not retrieved. Clements proposes paying for the storage until he can collect his things, showing his intent to preserve them despite the time constraints. However, the firm is firm on the policy, reiterating the need for an additional agreement to keep his belongings past the initial date.
2.	COORDINATION OF PROPERTY COLLECTION AND FINAL NOTICE FOR GEORGE CLEMENTS' BELONGINGS	The document contains an email exchange regarding George Clements' efforts to coordinate the collection of his belongings from a property at Unit 2005. After the Residential Tenancy Board granted permission for disposal, Clements designated specific contacts to retrieve his items, while the property management reiterated strict deadlines for collection. Ashley Helle, a legal coordinator, specified that any belongings not collected by October 2 would be discarded, as the property would no longer store the items beyond the agreed date. Clements communicated this deadline to his designated contacts, attempting to facilitate timely retrieval.
3.	NOTICE OF PROPERTY DISPOSAL HEARING AND COSTS - GEORGE CLEMENTS AT 5770 SPRING GARDEN ROAD	The document contains an email exchange about the disposal of items from George Clements' former unit at 5770 Spring Garden Road. CAPREIT, represented by Ashley Helle, notified Clements of a pending hearing with the Nova Scotia Tenancy Board to address costs related to storing and discarding items left behind. The email mentions previous discussions about property removal and associated expenses. Clements responded to the notification by humorously stating, ***"Not my fridge magnets***," underscoring the unusual focus on seemingly trivial items amidst the ongoing property dispute.

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
CORRESPONDENCE WITH CAR SHOPS		
1.	CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING REPAIRS FOR BEIGE BMW [*EUROPEAN AUTO*]	email correspondences between George and European Auto Services concerning the repair process for a beige BMW with New Brunswick plates. It outlines the steps taken to source parts, including issues with finding used parts, alternatives proposed, and discussions about cost management. The communications reflect ongoing challenges with obtaining necessary components, such as a steering rack, and considerations of alternative sourcing to manage repair expenses. The emails capture the timeline of requests, responses, and updates, highlighting the extensive effort made by both parties to facilitate and expedite the repair process.
2.	FOLLOW-UP CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING ISSUES POST-REPAIR OF BEIGE BMW	Email from George to European Auto Services following the completion of repairs referenced as Work Order 40637. George notes that upon picking up his vehicle, the ABS warning lights were on, and an exhaust leak was present. The document highlights that George sought a response or acknowledgment from European Auto Services regarding these issues but did not receive any reply. This follow-up reflects the continued challenges George faced after the initial repair process and underscores the lack of post-repair communication from the service provider.
3.	COMMUNICATION REGARDING STATUS AND ISSUES POST-REPAIR OF BEIGE BMW [*ALPINE MOTORS*]	Exchanges between George and Alpine Motors, a repair shop in New Brunswick, regarding the repair status of his beige 2010 BMW 328i x-drive. George initially reached out to check the progress of the repairs and expressed concerns about issues such as a loud exhaust leak and the car entering limp mode. The correspondence details his attempt to coordinate a pickup date and discuss the remaining issues with the vehicle. This communication reflects George's proactive efforts in addressing ongoing repair needs and ensuring the vehicle's functionality after transferring it to this new repair shop.
4.	CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING VEHICLE UPDATE AND STORAGE COSTS [*ALPINE MOTORS*]	Email communications between George Clements and Alpine Motors related to an update on his beige 2010 BMW 328XI. George acknowledged Alpine Motors' decision to cover storage costs due to an internal office mix-up. He referenced a previous discussion with Chloe involving potential wheel bearing and exhaust repairs and asked for a reassessment of the vehicle to determine additional work needed. George also informed Alpine Motors about delays in retrieving his vehicle due to his law school graduation and bar exam preparations, requesting if it was acceptable to pick up the car three weeks later. Alpine Motors confirmed there would be no storage fees due to their oversight.
5.	INVOICE AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR 2010 BMW 328XI [*ALPINE MOTORS*]	Email exchange between George Clements and Alpine Motors concerning the handling of his 2010 BMW 328XI. The discussion references an invoice sent by Alpine Motors and details regarding the potential removal of the vehicle. George expressed concerns

CONFIDENTIAL

		about finding a place to relocate the car and indicated that he was reaching out to contacts for assistance. Alpine Motors stated that if the vehicle was not removed by a set deadline, storage fees would begin to accumulate. This correspondence highlights the logistical and financial challenges George faced concerning the vehicle's repair status and storage arrangements.
6.	**AUTHORIZATION AND ISSUES WITH VEHICLE PICKUP - 2010 BMW 328IX DRIVE [*ALPINE MOTORS*]**	Series of emails regarding George Clements' authorization for Chris Bonnevie to pick up his 2010 BMW 328iX Drive from Alpine Motors. It reveals that when Chris arrived to collect the vehicle, it would not start. Although Alpine Motors initially agreed to waive all outstanding charges, complications arose when George prepared to have the vehicle towed. Alpine Motors then indicated that towing would not be allowed until certain conditions were met. This correspondence highlights the ongoing challenges in resolving the vehicle's removal, including fluctuating terms related to fees and vehicle release logistics.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

No.	Document Name	Description
	YouTube Videos	
1.	**Part 1**	In this video, I provide a personal update on my recent experiences and challenges. I start by addressing my absence from communication and explain the circumstances that led me to this point, including my current location in Cairo. I dive into the details of a legal case where I was charged with criminal harassment following a breakup. I outline the events that led to the charges, my interactions with the police, and the evidence I've gathered to prove my innocence. I share how this situation has affected my personal and professional life, detailing my background as a law graduate and my aspirations in the legal field. I reflect on the systemic issues I've encountered, including misconduct by the police and biases in the legal system, and describe my efforts to address these challenges through documentation and legal channels. I also talk about the emotional and psychological toll this experience has taken on me, as well as the impact on my relationships and career. Throughout the video, I aim to provide a clear narrative of what happened, the actions I've taken, and my ongoing efforts to move forward and rebuild after these events.
2.	**Part 2**	In this video, I delve into part two of my story, highlighting the numerous challenges and hurdles I've faced while trying to share my experiences. Initially, I intended to collaborate with someone to produce this, but communication inexplicably broke down, leading me to believe there are deliberate attempts to obstruct my efforts. Despite this, I persist, driven by the importance of shedding light on systemic issues in Canada, including corruption, misconduct, and legal injustices. I explore my concerns with the legal system, particularly pointing out how a King's Counsel, someone expected to uphold the highest standards of the legal profession, acted against their client's interests. I also discuss the troubling misuse of public utilities and resources to harass me, using documented instances to substantiate these claims. Furthermore, I reflect on the psychological and emotional toll of the events surrounding my case, from surveillance to entrapment attempts, and the significant fallout in my personal and professional life. I recount incidents where the justice system, university administration, and other actors appeared to be complicit in creating an environment of hostility, pushing me to the brink. These events include targeted actions to discredit me, fabricated charges of harassment, and attempts to manipulate perceptions of my character. I also examine potential conflicts of interest, noting connections between individuals in my case and the legal community that raise questions about fairness and

CONFIDENTIAL

		transparency. Through this video, I aim to unravel the layers of systemic issues, connect dots based on my experiences, and invite the public to critically assess the integrity of the institutions involved. While acknowledging the immense pain and loss I've endured, my focus remains on exposing the truth and advocating for accountability, fairness, and reform within the systems that failed me.
3.	SCAPEGOAT	I shared a series of personal experiences where I faced injustice and false accusations throughout my life. In high school, I was wrongly accused of destroying property at a party, which led to social ostracism until my innocence was eventually proven. Another time, a local traffic officer unfairly targeted me with a severe driving offense ticket, which escalated to a trial despite no evidence. In a separate incident, I faced false allegations of misconduct after a party, enduring months of social isolation before a witness stepped forward to reveal the truth. I also experienced being assaulted at a party, only to be astonishingly charged with assault myself. Thankfully, witness testimonies led to those charges being dropped. Other incidents include a home invasion by acquaintances, unjust police involvement after I evicted a disruptive house guest, and campus bans at Dalhousie and UNB for minor or misunderstood reasons. These experiences have highlighted systemic biases, racial profiling, and the misuse of authority, leaving me frustrated at being repeatedly scapegoated. However, I've learned that perseverance is key, and the truth has a way of eventually coming to light.
4.	PART 3	I detailed a series of strange and frustrating events, including the mysterious tampering of my car, which led to significant inconvenience and expense. This, coupled with the sudden breakdown of a relationship and the loss of sentimental items like a collection of fridge magnets and a treasured yearbook, felt like a series of setbacks aimed at destabilizing me. I also reflected on a troubling experience where someone I trusted weaponized my vulnerabilities, including an unwarranted threat to call the police. This incident and others revealed the challenges of being misunderstood and mischaracterized, even by those who claim to understand the systemic inequalities I've faced. These moments have underscored the misuse of power and the profound personal impact it can have. Despite these setbacks, I've started planning my next steps. I've been applying to LLM programs and certifications to bolster my qualifications, aiming to re-enter the professional world even stronger. I'm determined to overcome these obstacles and reclaim the opportunities I've worked hard for. Through it all, I've realized the importance of perseverance, self-reflection, and planning for a better future.
5.	PART 4	In this update, I reflected on the complexities of my breakup and the lingering challenges that have made moving forward difficult. Friends often ask why I didn't walk away earlier, and I wanted to share the nuanced and sometimes hidden dynamics that made the

CONFIDENTIAL

		situation feel inescapable. The relationship, despite its good moments, evolved into something unhealthy, with elements of control and interference even after we broke up. Attempts to reconnect with others were often sabotaged, and rumors spread about me, which created unnecessary drama and made it harder to move on. It felt like my ability to heal and rebuild was being systematically undermined. I shared specific anecdotes, like the challenges of trying to meet new people or even maintain platonic friendships, as interference and unfounded accusations kept cropping up. These experiences were frustrating, isolating, and exhausting, compounded by the way narratives about me were shaped and shared without context. It was difficult to reconcile what was happening, especially given how public some of the fallout became, culminating in a breakup that escalated to involvement with law enforcement and even the legal system. Looking back, I can see how certain patterns and red flags played a role, and while I'm not proud of everything, I know my intentions were never malicious or harmful. This has been a learning experience, albeit a painful one, teaching me about resilience, self-awareness, and boundaries.
6.	**PART 5: THE GIRL WHO CRIED WOLF**	In this video I am including body cam footage from the night at Ashleys's apartment which clearly corroborate my side of the story.
7.	**A CONVERSATION WITH THE PRINCESS OF PERSIA**	In this update, I delved deeper into the manipulative dynamics that seemed to play a significant role in the challenging period following my breakup. The conversation with Elaina highlighted how she was forced into the situation, manipulated, and sometimes turned against me, whether knowingly or unknowingly. Her reflections shed light on the toxic patterns that characterized this phase, including the influence of Ashley's narratives and the broader context of misunderstandings. Elaina states she was trying to "get the tea" by maintaining contact with Ashley, despite knowing something felt off, was revealing. It showed how situations like this can pull people into unnecessary drama, even when their intentions might be to help. Her eventual realization that Ashley's behaviour was calculated, and manipulative was validating, as it aligned with the larger patterns I had observed. The conversation also touched on broader issues, including the disparities in how people's experiences are treated based on societal biases. Elena shared her own struggles with being believed and finding justice, which added depth to the discussion about how narratives are shaped and who gets to control them.
8.		

CONFIDENTIAL

[This Page is Intentionally Left Blank]

CONFIDENTIAL